

for increase of pay for keepers and surfmen in the Life-Saving Service—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Petition of Mary M. Shriver, of Guernsey County, Ohio, to accompany House bill granting her a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEYMOUTH: Petition of citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Massachusetts, favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILCOX: Petition of Bishop & Co., of Honolulu, H. I., in relation to the redemption of Hawaiian silver—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the Morgan Memorial Association, of Winchester, Va., favoring an appropriation for the erection of a monument to mark the resting place of Gen. Daniel Morgan, of the Revolutionary war—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of the Pasteur Vaccine Company, of Chicago, Ill., opposing the free distribution of medicinal remedies—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the American Trade Press Association, for better mail facilities at the New York post-office—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of John Wyeth & Bro., chemists, of Philadelphia, Pa., in relation to the revenue tax upon certain unpounded drugs or chemicals—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, remonstrances of George W. Kirchner and W. Dewees Fryer, of Philadelphia, Pa., against the passage of House bill No. 12743—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, for such legislation as will strengthen our maritime position—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 5, 1901.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SEWELL, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

DEATH OF QUEEN VICTORIA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State and another from Lord Pauncefote. The one from Lord Pauncefote will be read.

The communication was read, as follows:

No. 40.] WASHINGTON, January 30, 1901.

SIR: I have the honor to state that I have received your note, No. 2062, of the 29th instant, in which you were good enough to transmit to me a copy of the resolution passed by the Senate of the United States on the 23d instant, in connection with the death of Her late Majesty.

I should be obliged if you would convey to the President of the Senate an expression of my sincere gratitude for this tribute to the Queen's memory, the text of which I have already communicated to my Government.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir, your most obedient humble servant,

PAUNCEFOTE.

The Hon. JOHN HAY, etc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communications will lie on the table.

REPORT OF COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Commissioner of Patents, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Commissioner of Patents for the year 1900. The Chair calls the attention of the Senate to this communication from the Commissioner of Patents. It is accompanied by a very large amount of matter, and the Chair supposes it ought to go to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. CHANDLER. I so move, Mr. President.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is the usual semiannual report, I suppose, and it ought to be printed and then referred to the Committee on Patents. These reports have always been printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What shall be done with the large number of documents that accompany the report?

Mr. HALE. Send them to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. COCKRELL. The report is always printed. It makes a good, large volume.

Mr. CHANDLER. The committee can report in one day. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The communication will be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, will be referred to the Committee on Printing, without objection.

WASHINGTON, ALEXANDRIA AND MOUNT VERNON RAILWAY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington, Alexandria and Mount Vernon Railway Company for the year ended December 31, 1900; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

A bill (S. 2871) to supplement and amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the North River Bridge Company and to authorize the construction of a bridge and approaches at New York City across the Hudson River, to regulate commerce in and over such bridge between the States of New York and New Jersey, and to establish such bridge a military and post road," approved July 11, 1890;

A bill (S. 3901) providing for allotments of land in severalty to the Indians of the La Pointe or Bad River Reservation, in the State of Wisconsin;

A bill (S. 5351) permitting the building of two dams across the Savannah River above the city of Augusta, in the State of Georgia;

A bill (S. 5717) to authorize the construction and to maintain a dam and wagon bridge across Twelvemile Bayou, in the parish of Caddo, in the State of Louisiana;

A bill (H. R. 10921) granting to Keokuk and Hamilton Water Power Company right to construct and maintain wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River in Hancock County, Ill.;

A bill (H. R. 11548) to authorize the Kingston Bridge and Terminal Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Clinch River at Kingston, Tenn.;

A bill (H. R. 13371) to authorize advances from the Treasury of the United States for the support of the government of the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 13399) for the establishment of a beacon light on Hambrook Bar, Choptank River, Maryland, and for other purposes; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 43) granting a life-saving medal of the first class to Lieut. Fidelio S. Carter, of the United States Navy.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13438) to authorize the United New Jersey Railroad and Canal Company and the Philadelphia and Trenton Railroad Company, or their successors, to construct and maintain a bridge across the Delaware River was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

INAUGURAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is desirable that a joint inaugural committee shall be appointed. The Chair appointed Senators on the inaugural committee under a Senate resolution, but now there has passed both Houses a provision for a joint committee, and under that concurrent resolution the Chair appoints the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HANNA], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

COUNT OF ELECTORAL VOTES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints as tellers on the part of the Senate to open the returns and count the votes of electors for President and Vice-President of the United States the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY].

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I rise to a privileged question. I present the credentials of the Senator-elect from the State of New Hampshire, which I ask may be read, printed in the RECORD, and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials were read, as follows:

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States:

This is to certify that on the 16th day of January, 1901, Henry E. Burnham was duly chosen by the legislature of the State of New Hampshire a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1901.

Witness: His excellency our governor, Chester B. Jordan, and our seal hereto affixed, at Concord, this 16th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1901.

By the governor:

[SEAL.] EDWARD N. PEARSON, Secretary of State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The credentials will be placed on file.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SEWELL. I present the petition of Henry L. Morse, president, W. Randall, superintendent, and 595 workmen and mechanics of the New York Shipbuilding Company, the largest company in the world, and probably the finest equipped, located at Camden, in my State, praying for the passage of the ship-subsidy

bill now before the Senate. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SEWELL presented a petition of sundry citizens of Summit, Newark, and Montclair, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the congregation of the Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect State antigambling laws from nullification through interstate gambling by telegraph, telephone, or otherwise; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to further protect the first day of the week as a day of rest in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Lucas Avenue Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict grounds of divorce and improve the procedure in the District of Columbia and the Territories, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CLAY presented petitions of the Board of Trade and Commercial League of Rome, the Chamber of Commerce of Macon, and the Board of Trade of Brunswick, all in the State of Georgia, praying that an appropriation be made providing for the continuance of the fast Southern mail; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. GALLINGER. I present a concurrent resolution of the legislature of New Hampshire, favoring the removal of the obstruction at Hendersons Point. I ask that the concurrent resolution be printed as a document and likewise printed in the RECORD, and that it be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed, and also ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State of New Hampshire, in the year of our Lord 1901. Concurrent resolution, offered by Senator Urch, of district No. 24.

Whereas there is being constructed at the Portsmouth (N. H.) Navy-Yard a magnificent naval stone dock of capacity sufficient to receive the largest war or merchant ship in the world, which, when completed, will be the direct means of the employment of thousands, and of deep interest to the whole southern section of our State; and

Whereas between our deep and magnificent harbor and the navy-yard and city, at a point in the narrowest and sharpest curve of the Piscataqua, there exists a dangerous obstruction called "Hendersons Point," for the contemplated removal of which surveys by the United States Engineers have just been completed and reported to the Chief Engineer of the War Department of the General Government; and

Whereas the removal of this sole danger spot and obstruction would make our historic river and harbor not only at once one of the safest of approach from and to the ocean, but would constitute them indisputably without a peer on the Atlantic coast: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring). That our Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in the National Congress from this State be, and hereby are, requested to exert their influence to secure an appropriation in the national river and harbor bill now pending, for the removal of Hendersons Point in Portsmouth Harbor; and be it further,

Resolved, That the secretary of state be directed to forward a copy of these resolutions to each member of Congress from this State.

Adopted January 29, 1901.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of 51 citizens of Lansdowne, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of the State Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Utah and a petition of the State Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Wisconsin, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the New Hebrides; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment:

A bill (H. R. 13606) authorizing the establishment of a first-order light at or near Hillsboro Point, Florida; and

A bill (S. 5776) for the establishment of a beacon light near Grubbs Landing, Delaware River, Delaware.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4983) granting a pension to Louisa A. Crosby; and

A bill (S. 4255) granting an increase of pension to Frank Smith. Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5410) granting an increase of pension to George M. Emery, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 11658) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Nelson;

A bill (H. R. 3232) granting an increase of pension to David Flinn; and

A bill (H. R. 5613) granting an increase of pension to Louis Nessell.

Mr. KYLE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5723) granting an increase of pension to Harrison T. De Long;

A bill (H. R. 6407) granting an increase of pension to Michael S. Brockett; and

A bill (H. R. 12411) granting a pension to Catherine T. Howell.

Mr. KYLE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5619) granting a pension to Charlotte H. Race, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4188) granting an increase of pension to George B. Cock, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DEPEW, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5588) to provide an American register for the steamer *Enterprise*, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5817) extending to the support of Everett, Wash., the privileges of the seventh section of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise without appraisal, reported it without amendment.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1755) granting a pension to John M. Core, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4084) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Pillow; and

A bill (S. 1647) granting a pension to John Canty.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 633) granting an increase of pension to Vianna Mallard; and

A bill (H. R. 8001) granting a pension to Sampson D. Bridgman.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5856) granting an increase of pension to Etta Adair Anderson, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3087) granting an increase of pension to Marcia M. Merritt, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5303) granting a pension to Julia A. Prouty, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. KENNEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5080) granting an increase of pension to James T. Chalfant; and

A bill (H. R. 12301) granting an increase of pension to Jacob E. Swap.

Mr. KENNEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5690) granting a pension to Mabel H. Lazear, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13802) supplemental to an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Reform School for Girls of the District of Columbia," approved July 9, 1888, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5814) to authorize the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala., reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13255) to authorize Jefferson County, Ark., to construct and maintain a free bridge across the Arkansas River within 5

miles of Pine Bluff, Jefferson County, Ark., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5834) granting an increase of pension to Enoch A. White, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5752) granting an increase of pension to Franklin B. Delany, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

MOUNT CARMEL DEVELOPMENT COMPANY.

Mr. MASON. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 13491) authorizing the Mount Carmel Development Company to draw water from Wabash River at Grand Rapids, Wabash County, Ill., to report it with an amendment, striking out the preamble, and I ask for its present consideration. It will not take any time. The bill has passed the House, and it is exactly similar to the bill called up on Saturday last by the Senator from Iowa and passed.

The Secretary read the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CULLOM. It is all right.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee report an amendment striking out the preamble. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

AMENDMENTS TO BILL PROPOSING TO REDUCE REVENUE.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. From the Committee on Finance I submit some amendments to the bill (H. R. 12394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder, which have been assented to by the committee. I ask that they may be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM. Are they long?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. No.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like to have them read.

Mr. HOAR. Let them be read.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. They are short.

Mr. HOAR. I ask that they be read.

Mr. CULLOM. Let them be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments relate to the internal-revenue bill, and they will be received and printed.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator from Connecticut said they are not long, and I ask that they may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the amendments will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a new section the following:

SEC. —. That on and after July 1, 1901, the tax on cigars weighing not more than 3 pounds per thousand shall be 18 cents per pound, and on cigarettes weighing not more than 3 pounds per thousand and of a wholesale value or price of not more than \$2 per thousand, shall be 18 cents per pound; and the tax on cigarettes weighing not more than 3 pounds per thousand and of a wholesale value or price of more than \$2 per thousand shall be 36 cents per pound; and all such cigars and cigarettes weighing not more than 3 pounds per thousand shall for purposes of taxation be held and considered as weighing 3 pounds.

It is proposed to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. —. That the following proviso be, and the same is hereby, added at the end of the second paragraph of Schedule A. of said act, approved June 13, 1898, relating to the sale of products and merchandise at exchanges: "And provided further, That no bill, memorandum, agreement, or other evidence of such sale, or agreement of sale, or agreement to sell, in case of products or merchandise actually delivered to, and while in vessel, boat, or car, and actually in course of transportation, shall be subject to this tax, provided such memorandum or agreement shall be accompanied by bills of lading or vouchers showing that the said products are actually in course of transportation, as aforesaid."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be printed and lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 5870) granting an increase of pension to William Nichol; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 5871) granting a pension to Thaddeus A. Smith, with accompanying papers;

A bill (S. 5872) granting an increase of pension to John Smith; and

A bill (S. 5873) granting an increase of pension to John A. Doyle.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (S. 5874) to establish a national military park at Washington's Crossing, New Jersey and Pennsylvania; and

A bill (S. 5875) for the relief of John W. Dampman (with accompanying papers).

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 5876) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Sharon, in the State of Pennsylvania; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 5877) to provide an American register for the barkentine *Hawaii*; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 5878) to provide for enlarging the public building at Kalamazoo, Mich.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. MCENERY introduced a bill (S. 5879) for the relief of Francois Bouligny and Mary Annette Bouligny; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 5880) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Charity M. Locke, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 5881) for the relief of William J. Wilcox, of Lauderdale County, Ala.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SULLIVAN introduced a bill (S. 5882) to extend the general land laws of the United States to the Territory of Hawaii, with rules and regulations for homestead entries by the Secretary of the Interior; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment providing that all lands in the State of Minnesota withdrawn from sale for the reason that said lands would be required for or subject to flowage in the construction of dams and other works proposed to be erected for the improvement of the navigation of the Mississippi River shall be subject to the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States," approved March 3, 1875, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SEWELL submitted an amendment providing for a preliminary survey of Rancocas River, New Jersey, with a view to obtaining a 6-foot channel from its mouth to Moores Landing, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment proposing to increase the salary of the United States consul at San Juan del Norte, Nicaragua, from \$2,500 to \$3,000, and providing an allowance of \$800 for clerk hire at that consulate, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$50,000 for the construction of lock and dam 4, for the purchase of land at lock and dam, if necessary, at Natrona, Pa., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEWART submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$100,000 for the purchase of guns and accessories for the United States Revenue-Cutter Service, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. WELLINGTON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$142,000 for improving Annapolis Harbor, Maryland, by straightening, widening, and deepening the channel of the entrance to that harbor, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PROCTOR submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,000 to pay the salary of the United States consul at Leghorn, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$3,000 to pay the salary of the United States consul at Quebec, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut submitted an amendment providing for the appointment of a consul-general at Coburg, Germany, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the salary of the consul-general at Ottawa, Ontario, from \$3,500 to \$4,000, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BACON submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$25,000 for the construction of a wharf, a road, and a storehouse, or for other original improvements at the Naval Training Station, Blythe Island, Georgia, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SEWELL submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for improving Mantua Creek, New Jersey, from \$25,000 to \$50,000, intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS.

Mr. TURLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 13382) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman act, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

GUSTAV A. HESSELBERGER.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I feel it my duty to move to recommit to the Committee on Military Affairs the bill (S. 3749) for the relief of Gustav A. Hesselberger.

The motion was agreed to.

INSTRUCTIONS TO COMMISSIONERS AT PARIS.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I submit a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 3,000 copies of the instructions and all accompanying papers of the President to the commissioners who negotiated the treaty with Spain at Paris.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. How much cost does it involve?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will state that it will not come anywhere near the limit of \$500.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

CORRESPONDENCE OF JOHN C. CALHOUN.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 15,000 additional copies of volume 2 of the annual report of the American Historical Association for 1899, being the correspondence of John C. Calhoun, of which 5,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 10,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

LICENSE FEES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. KENNEY submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia be, and they are hereby, directed to report to the Senate such a schedule of license fees as in their opinion should be levied and collected on the different trades, professions, occupations, and business enterprises in the District of Columbia.

COMPILATION OF PURE FOOD AND DRUG LAWS.

Mr. MASON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures is hereby directed to have prepared for its use a compilation of the pure food and drug laws of the United States and foreign countries, the clerical expenses incident to said work to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate, not to exceed the sum of \$600.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had, on the 2d instant, approved and signed the act (S. 4300) to increase the efficiency of the permanent military establishment of the United States.

The message also announced that the President of the United States had on the 4th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 3148) to correct the military record of William La-point; and

An act (S. 5337) providing for the construction of a steam revenue cutter for service in the harbor of Boston, Mass.

The message further announced that the President of the United States had on this day approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 2055) for the promotion and retirement of P. A. Surg. John F. Bransford, United States Navy; and

An act (S. 5585) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia."

DEPORTATION OF GEORGE T. RICE.

Mr. TELLER. On Saturday I introduced a resolution, which went over on objection, and yesterday I asked that it might lie over until to-day. I desire to call up that resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution submitted by the Senator from Colorado, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution submitted by Mr. TELLER on the 2d instant, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is directed to report to the Senate whether the statements in the public press that one George T. Rice, the editor of the Daily Bulletin, published at Manila, has been deported from Manila to the United States by the authority of the general commanding in the Philippines; and, if such deportation has taken place, of what offense was the said Rice convicted, or if not convicted, with what offense he was charged, together with such evidence as he may have on which such conviction or charge was based.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, when I submitted this resolution I had no idea of making any remarks whatever on it. When I called for information in a resolution respectful in character and in entire accordance with the customs of the Senate, and the resolution was read, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] objected to it; which was in keeping with what has been the custom during this session, at least, and perhaps at one or two others which have preceded it. All these requests for information are objected to at least on the day of their presentation, and frequently at later periods.

When I introduced the resolution calling for the information I intended to have waited until it came to us before I said anything to the Senate on the subject. I know how unsatisfactory it is to submit such a question on a common newspaper report, and for that reason I wanted the Department to say upon what ground this man had been deported. I supposed from the statement I saw that he had been deported to the island of Guam, but I have since learned that he has been deported to the United States.

I want to read here a press dispatch which came to me the next morning after I had made an allusion to this matter in a speech I made in the Senate. I had not then seen the dispatch, which is entitled:

MACARTHUR ORDERS DEPORTATION OF A DEFIANT EDITOR FROM MANILA.
MANILA, January 24, 1901.

General MacArthur has ordered the deportation to the United States of George T. Rice, editor of the Daily Bulletin, a marine journal. Rice will sail Monday. The order characterizes him as a "dangerous incendiary and a menace to the military situation."

Rice's offense was publishing a statement that Lieutenant Braunersreuth, captain of the port, had charged excessive pilotage fees, a percentage of which he had kept for himself.

I have the original paper here in which the charge was made on which this man was deported, which I intend to read later:

The report of Major Mills, inspector-general, who investigated the allegation, completely exonerated the captain of the port and contradicted the editor and the merchants who had given him information, and who had been misled by figuring the rates upon the net instead of the gross tonnage, the latter being specified under the Spanish law.

Rice was summoned to the office of the governor-general's military secretary and called upon to promise that he would publish no more such articles. He declined to give such a pledge, but insisted that the article was truthful, and took up a defiant attitude when threatened with deportation.

Mr. President, I am not surprised that the editor of this paper took a defiant attitude when threatened with deportation. I suppose he was aware that there was not any law in the United States which prescribed deportation as a punishment for any crime whatever; and as a citizen of the State of Minnesota and as a citizen of the United States, I do not wonder that he was somewhat defiant.

The deportation order was then issued, and Rice is now awaiting the departure of the *Pennsylvania*. When seen in jail to-day he reiterated his statement that the charges were true and declared that in any event the severity of the sentence was unmerited. Rice came originally from Red Wing, Minn., and was formerly a member of the Minnesota volunteers.

I want to say that I do not know whether under this order the newspaper was suppressed or not, but I am credibly informed that the military authorities since last December have suppressed no less than four papers—La Oceania Española, La Democracia, El Filipino Libre, and yesterday or the day before the dispatches contained a notice that General MacArthur had also suppressed the *Diario*, or *Daily*, which I understand is one of the old conservative papers of Manila.

Mr. President, I have here a letter addressed to me, which I propose to read, from a citizen of the State of Colorado, with whom I have a slight personal acquaintance. He writes:

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., January 23, 1901.

Senator HENRY M. TELLER, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Kindly permit me to call your attention to the inclosed clippings—

The clippings are those which I just read—

relative to the deportation of an American citizen and the imprisonment of the gentleman in question in Manila. The facts, briefly, are these: As a representative of the Denver Evening Post I enlisted with the First Colorado Infantry and went to the Philippines, where I served as a corporal in Company M. At the expiration of my term of service, or rather when the regiment was ordered home, I took my discharge there and became a member of

the staff on the American, the leading paper in Manila. Having had considerable experience in newspaper work, I was rapidly advanced from a reporter to city editor, then to telegraph editor, then to managing editor, and finally became a half owner in that paper. I remained there in charge of the paper until I was called to my home in this city by the illness of my wife, last February. While in Manila last fall the merchants, irrespective of nationality, were so pleased with the manner in which that paper was conducted that they asked me to start the publication of a marine journal (daily) for their special benefit, pledging a liberal patronage. I, of course, complied with the request, and the Manila Daily Bulletin was started. It contains nothing but shipping news and information of interest to the merchant marine, but the information it contains is reliable and correct, being obtained from the importers and exporters themselves.

From the inclosed marked copies of the Bulletin you will see wherein the editor of the Bulletin has offended, and for which he is thrown in jail, like a common felon, among the deserters, murderers, and thieves, and there held to await deportation to this country. By the inclosed clipping it will also be seen that Mr. Rice sailed to-day on board the troopship *Pennsylvania* as a prisoner, and all merely because he asserted his American manhood and declined to apologize to a big, fat, and lazy lieutenant of the Navy who held the position of captain of the port. I am still financially interested in both the American and Bulletin, and, as a citizen of Colorado, I call these matters to your attention, Senator, with the request that an investigation of the affair be had, and Mr. Rice be given an opportunity to prove his statements. This he did not have in Manila. He was not called upon to produce any witnesses, but solely upon the recommendation of Inspector-General Mills—who appears to be a warm personal friend of the captain of the port—he is thrown in jail and shipped as a prisoner to this country. I visited Senator Patterson and submitted the articles complained of to him. He suggested that I write to you with the request to take the matter up. The Rocky Mountain News this morning contained an editorial, a copy of which I inclose.

Thanking you in advance for any attention you may give this matter, I remain,

Your most obedient servant,

WILL J. MATTHEWS.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator from Colorado allow me to just make one observation?

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator's correspondent is not more correctly informed in regard to other matters than he is in the assertion he makes that the captain of the port is a "big, fat, and lazy" officer, I would not give much for his information. I have known Lieutenant Braunersthen personally for years, and there is no more honorable, upright, and honest gentleman in the Navy to-day.

Mr. TELLER. Well, Mr. President, what my correspondent says about the lieutenant is a side remark, but I expected, of course, somebody would get up here and defend this outrageous proceeding on some pretense or other. When it can not be done upon any principle it will be done in some such way as that.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will allow me, I am only defending the good name of a naval officer. Unfortunately, our naval officers do not have the right of suffrage, and consequently they do not have so many defenders as gentlemen who have the right of suffrage.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will wait with patience, he will see that I am not attacking the lieutenant at all. I am not dealing with the lieutenant. The Senator is a little premature in his suggestion that I am moving because somebody has got the right of suffrage. I am moving because a citizen of the United States is outraged; at least, such appears to be the fact from the proof that comes to me.

Now, I am going to read the article for the publication of which this man was deported, and when I have got through I want some American Senator to rise here and say that he defends this transaction. If anyone should do so, Mr. President, it will be the first time in this country that any man in public or private life has attempted to defend a transaction of this character. This is the identical article for which this man was deported. I also have the next article that appeared in his paper after he had expressed his defiance when they threatened to deport him. I read from the Daily Bulletin, published on the 14th day of last month. In the previous issue he had been printing the pilotage and moorage regulations, and he continued to print them, I suppose, until he had concluded them. Then he commented upon them and said:

We print the above pilot and moorage regulations for the benefit and on the request of the several business men of Manila. That these regulations are lived up to would not be vouched for should an investigation disclose the inner workings of the captain of the ports to the public. The competitive examination of pilots is not enforced, or if it is this is done in a very slack manner. There are two pilots now in the service who have not undergone this examination.

That is provided for in the port regulations.

The many accidents on the river, the fault of which nearly always lies with the pilot, shows that either examinations are not held or the men do not receive the proper reprimand for their ignorance or carelessness. The regulations say that the chief pilot should own a captain's certificate; also that if a pilot should be found unsuitable on account of short sight or other defects or owing to want of sound health and strength to carry out fully his duty, his dismissal from the service should be proposed, etc. If any should ask for the chief pilot, he would be directed to that gentleman's house, where he would find him incapacitated for any physical duty. He has been in the condition for four months, with something wrong with his hip. Certainly this would be classed in "unsuitable." Following further, the chief pilot has not a captain's certificate, another breach in the regulations.

In article 9: "The senior pilot shall see that all the following books are kept with exactness."

That is a quotation from article 9 of the regulations:

Read the article to the end. The public, especially those interested, have

expressed a desire to have a glance at all these books. Methinks that just at present they are kept in the vapory sense of remembrance. The registering of accidents, for instance, there has been so many that the book would be of technical and historical value. In this book the public should find ad verbatim every mishap on the river and bay and the cause and effect thereof. Think of the intrinsic value of such a volume. It would be worth its weight in gold. But (we are sorry to herald the sad tidings to the public) these books are claimed to be a thing ethereal. It also says that a record "shall" be kept of all accidents that occur to vessels which have the misfortune to carry no pilot. We are told that this book is kept. Certainly; why not? We should like to have, for the benefit of our readers, "a register book in which a monthly statement is to be made of the places where the River Pasig has been dragged, the depth of the water in ebb tide before and after said operation took place, and all other circumstances that will facilitate the formation of an exact judgment of the state of the river and its channel. Indeed, this book would be very valuable for a scientific publication, also to prove "that there has been five times more work done on the Pasig River during American occupation than the Spanish Government did in five years." For this purpose the book would be a judge and jury. However, we have noticed only one dredger on the river, and that sticks very tenaciously to one particular berth, sometimes to the extent of a month.

Then he quotes again from the regulations:

"The pilots shall keep a rigorous watch day and night * * * if called upon, to take part of the duties in extraordinary or special cases." Of this article we would ask a question. If the pilots are continually on watch, why do they not examine the moorings of all vessels in the river during stormy weather? If this was done there would be no accidents such as happened in a recent typhoon. A pilot is paid handsomely for this work and there is no excuse for such accidents. The uniforms of the pilots may be a fact in the regulations, but the "wearing fact" is somewhat misrepresented. Why is it that vessels which come into the river without a pilot pay the same as those who have pilots? Read article 33, then ask yourself whose fault would it be should a vessel break its moorings during the passing of a typhoon. This article is one of the most important and should be rigidly enforced. Articles 34, 35, and 36 would make new puns for some comic paper the way the regulations are now enforced and carried out. Article 37 is of vital importance and deserves more than a mere glance. In the following articles, which relate to the "average and reserve" fund, it would be well to ask, Are they subscribing now? There has not been a claim paid from this or any other fund for accidents and delays of vessels since the American occupation of Manila.

Read article 43: after looking up the former articles this article appears nonsensical. Of article 44 there arises several questions. What did the pilots do with the fund they had in the bank during the Spanish rule; was it not withdrawn on the advent of the Americans? Now, what right had they to withdraw this money? Is there any bank account, such as authorized by the regulations, placed in any bank in Manila? We think not.

We have touched very lightly on some of the principal points in the above regulations, but, should necessity demand it, we will bear down on this question several degrees harder, hard enough, in fact, to make some who have not lived up to these regulations squeal. Some questions which the business men of Manila wish to ask are: Should not a board of inquiry be held in the event of accidents occurring to a vessel in charge of a pilot, is the captain of the port supposed to be judge and jury in such a case, and are not all entitled to the respect and simple courtesy of gentlemen as long as they behave themselves as such?

The regulations would be bettered by an investigation, and it is hoped that such a matter of importance will not go unnoticed "by the powers that be."

Mr. President, there is the article upon which this deportation took place. I say if that is an offense that should subject a man to be confined in jail, there is not an editor in the United States who runs a newspaper of any character whatever who could not be sent to jail. I wish Senators would look at this article and read it in the RECORD.

I understand that this is the only offense that this man committed, and I hope that the War Department will condescend to respect this resolution if it shall pass, and, if they have anything else, that they will send it to us. That is the reason I am reading it to-day, so that, if they have anything more, they will send it here. I hope for the credit of the Army and the credit of the Government that they have something more, but I do not believe they have.

I now take the next article which appeared on the following day, which is headed "Debarred."

DEBARRED?—"YOU ARE DEBARRED FROM ENTERING THE BUILDING BY ORDER OF THE CAPTAIN."

This is the verbal order received yesterday afternoon from Mr. Taylor, chief clerk at the captain of the port, by the editor of the Daily Bulletin. We are "debarred" from entering the captain of the port's on what grounds, and with what are we charged? Yesterday morning the editor was called into the office of the captain of the port and asked in a roundabout way to retract what he said in the editorial of the issue dated the 14th.

That is what I have read.

Because we would not crawl to the tune of the captain of the port, and refused to forsake the truth, we are "debarred" from entering that building. Indeed! and under what monarchy were laws of such a nature instituted? Who owns the building, that a man can be ordered out for speaking the truth? Surely a government of such boasted freedom as ours would not issue such an order. The Daily Bulletin is published for and supported by the business men of Manila; therefore, if we speak the truth, and the truth make guilty ones uneasy, we speak it in the interest of those from whom we gain our support. The captain of the port may have the almighty power to order us out of the buildings given in his charge by the Government, but he has not the power to stop us when we are in the right. To quote from our last editorial, "should necessity demand it, we will bear down on this question several degrees harder—hard enough, in fact, to make some who have not lived up to these regulations squeal." The "necessity" is apparent, and we will be heard from.

Mr. President, I believe that all the offense this man committed was the writing of those two articles. For that he has been taken, without any opportunity of making a defense, as my correspondent says, and deported to the United States. What became of his newspaper I do not know. Whether it was suspended,

as other newspapers in the Philippines were, I am not able to state.

That is the condition under which this resolution is offered, and that is the condition in which it will be sent, if it be sent at all, by the Senate to the War Department.

I do not desire to take up much time upon this subject, but I want to say that it is not a small matter, and it is not to be whistled down the wind. I regard it as a grievous offense against the liberty of a citizen of the United States that he can be taken from any place under the jurisdiction of the United States and sent here under such a pretense as is made in this charge, that "he is a dangerous incendiary and a menace to the military situation." There is no such offense known to the criminal statutes of the United States or any of the States of this Union; it is not known in any republic; and it is not known in any free country in the world.

This is but one man, but, Mr. President, he is a citizen of the United States. An offense against him is an offense against me and is an offense against every other citizen of the United States. An outrage upon his rights is an outrage upon mine and upon the rights of everybody else. If there can be any justification for what has been done, if the Department have any further charges against this man, let them present them here; but I venture to say, Mr. President, that they have not any such charges on file there. If they conclude that they want to maintain the secrecy that we hear so much about these days, and that they are afraid if they should give us the evidence they have against this man he might escape conviction, I suppose they will fall back on the plea that the public interests do not justify answering the request of the Senate.

I have here, Mr. President, an address made by a gentleman high in the legal profession at the celebration of Marshall day, which took place yesterday. The particular part of the address to which I desire to call the attention of the Senate is headed "Not a time for despair," and I will ask consent that it may be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of objection, the extract referred to will be printed in the RECORD.

The extract from the address referred to is as follows:

NOT A TIME FOR DESPAIR.

And although many good and thoughtful people are just now greatly troubled at what seems to them an evil promise of the future, as American lawyers we must never for a moment, in dark days or in bright, despair of the Republic. Differences of opinion may well exist as to the best methods of discharging the grave and serious duties unexpectedly devolved upon us by a war begun with the noble object of helping a struggling people to secure their independence; but let us trust that however we may differ as to methods we all believe that the true glory of America and her true mission in the new century, as in the old, is what a great prelate of the Catholic Church has recently declared it to be: To stand fast by Christ and His gospel; to cultivate not the Moslem virtues of war, of slaughter, of rapine, and of conquest, but the Christian virtues of self-denial and kindness and brotherly love, and that it is our mission not to harm but to help to a better life every fellow-creature, of whatever color and however weak or lowly; and then we may some day hear the benediction: "Inasmuch as ye did it to one of the least of these, my brethren, ye did it unto me."

When we come at last to believe that the true mission of nations, as of men, is to promote righteousness on earth; that conferring liberty is wiser than making gain; that new friends are better for us than new markets; that love is more elevating than hatred; that peace is nobler than war; that the humblest human life is sacred; that the humblest human right should be respected; and it is only by recognizing these truths, which can never fail to be true, that our own beloved country can worthily discharge the sacred mission confided to her and maintain her true dignity and grandeur, setting her feet upon the shining pathway which leads to the sunlit summits of the olive mountains, and taking abundant care that every human creature beneath her starry flag, of every color and condition, is as secure of liberty, of justice, and of peace as in the republic of God.

In cherishing these aspirations and in striving to realize them we are wholly in the spirit of the great Chief Justice; and we can in no other way so effectually honor his memory as by laboring in season and out of season to make this whole continent of America "one vast and splendid monument, not of oppression and terror, but of wisdom, of peace, and of liberty, on which men may gaze with admiration forever."

Mr. TELLER. I want to say that even if the last hour of the session were at hand I would not make any apology for taking up the time of the Senate with a matter of this character. Nor do I make nor would I make any apology if, because of my intervention here, the last hour of this Congress had arrived without the appropriation bills being enacted and an extra session should therefore be rendered necessary. I would feel justified in standing here and calling the attention of the country to this outrage upon a citizen of the United States, even under such circumstances as those.

Fortunately, no harm can come of this delay. I am morally certain that what I say here will have but little attention paid to it, but I suggest to Senators that there is not anything more important than the question of the liberty of a citizen. I know, Mr. President, that we have fallen upon times when matters of this kind excite no interest whatever. Whether this arises out of the war in which we are engaged or whether it arises out of the feeling that one must not say anything in the way of criticism of the Army in the field, or whether it arises out of the feeling that any criticism of illegal acts, the excessive use of power, or acts of

tyranny, is a sort of an attack upon the Administration—what it is I do not know—but all these suggestions of impropriety, of misconduct anywhere, are met with severe criticism and rebuke. I shall take occasion to call attention to this case again should we ever get the report from the War Department upon it, and if we do not, I shall call attention to it again anyhow.

The other day I wanted to read, but forgot to read, as I was practically through, a quotation from the speech that Mr. Webster made in 1834 in the Senate of the United States. I know the impatience of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], and I join with him in it, to proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill, and, therefore, I am not going to read it, but I ask that it may be printed at the close of my remarks; and with that I will close.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the extracts will be printed in the RECORD.

The extracts referred to are as follows:

The question is, therefore, whether, upon the true principles of the Constitution, this exercise of power by the President can be justified. Whether the consequences be prejudicial or not, if there be an illegal exercise of power, it is to be resisted in the proper manner. Even if no harm or inconvenience result from transgressing the boundary, the intrusion is not to be suffered to pass unnoticed. Every encroachment, great or small, is important enough to awaken the attention of those who are intrusted with the preservation of a constitutional government. We are not to wait till great public mischiefs come, till the Government is overthrown or liberty itself put into extreme jeopardy. We should not be worthy sons of our fathers were we so to regard great questions affecting the general freedom. Those fathers accomplished the revolution on a strict question of principle.

The Parliament of Great Britain asserted a right to tax the colonies in all cases whatsoever; and it was precisely on this question that they made the Revolution turn. The amount of taxation was trifling, but the claim itself was inconsistent with liberty; and that was, in their eyes, enough. It was against the recital of an act of Parliament, rather than against any suffering under its enactments, that they took up arms. They went to war against a preamble. They fought seven years against a declaration. They poured out their treasures and their blood like water in a contest against an assertion which those less sagacious and not so well schooled in the principles of civil liberty would have regarded as barren phraseology or mere parade of words. They saw in the claim of the British Parliament a seminal principle of mischief, the germ of unjust power; they detected it, dragged it forth from underneath its plausible disguises, struck at it; nor did it elude either their steady eye or their well-directed blow till they had extirpated and destroyed it to the smallest fiber. On this question of principle, while actually suffering was yet afar off, they raised their flag against a power to which, for purposes of foreign conquest and subjugation, Rome in the height of her glory is not to be compared; a power which has dotted over the surface of the whole globe with her possessions and military posts, whose morning drum-beat, following the sun and keeping company with the hours, circles the earth with one continuous and unbroken strain of the martial airs of England. (From pp. 109 and 110, of vol. 4.)

All republics, all governments of law, must impose numerous limitations and qualifications of authority and give many positive and many qualified rights. In other words, they must be subject to rule and regulation. This is the very essence of free political institutions. The spirit of liberty is, indeed, a bold and fearless spirit; but it is also a sharp-sighted spirit; it is a cautious, sagacious, discriminating, far-seeing intelligence; it is jealous of encroachment, jealous of power, jealous of man. It demands checks; it seeks for guards; it insists on securities; it intrenches itself behind strong defenses, and fortifies itself with all possible care against the assaults of ambition and passion. It does not trust the amiable weaknesses of human nature, and therefore it will not permit power to overstep its prescribed limits, though benevolence, good intent, and patriotic purpose come along with it. Neither does it satisfy itself with flashy and temporary resistance to illegal authority. Far otherwise. It seeks for duration and permanence. It looks before and after; and, building on the experience of ages which are past, it labors diligently for the benefit of ages to come. This is the nature of constitutional liberty; and this is our liberty, if we will rightly understand and preserve it. (From Mr. Webster's speech in the Senate on May 7, 1834, on the President's protest. See Webster's Works, vol. 4, p. 122.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE.

Mr. McMILLAN. I request that the Committee on Commerce may sit during the sessions of the Senate. It is now at work on the river and harbor bill, and the committee would like to have permission to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan, for the Committee on Commerce, asks leave that the committee be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13575) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.

The reading of the bill was resumed, beginning at line 22, page 16.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 16, line 22, to increase the appropriation for continuation of the work on the Arizona avenue sewer from \$50,000 to \$75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, after line 8, to insert:

For sewage disposal system pumping station, \$400,000. And the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into contract or

contracts for the completed building and so much of the machinery as may be immediately needed, at a cost not to exceed \$750,000.

For low-area trunk sewer, \$120,000.
Any balances of former appropriations remaining after the execution of contracts for works of the sewage-disposal system may be applied by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the execution of other portions of said sewage-disposal system.

Mr. ALLISON. Yesterday the Senator from New Hampshire made some criticisms of these items. I ask that the items, beginning in line 9 and ending in line 21, page 17, may be passed for the moment. I will recur to them when the Senator from New Hampshire comes in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, they will be passed over.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yesterday I asked that some amendments on page 14 might be passed over, and I stated to the Senator from Iowa some complaints which I had heard about the provisions made for the improvement of streets. Last night I made some further inquiries of the gentleman who had made complaint to me about the committee in connection with this matter, and I should like to state now what was stated to me, so that the matter can be understood when it is taken up at such time as the Senate chooses to dispose of it.

Mr. ALLISON. I am ready to take it up now.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I wish to make a statement in connection with it, so that the Senate can have the benefit of the complaints made. I do not know anything about the foundation for them.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator desires to take up that question now, I have no objection to disposing of it. I think we might as well do so.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not care whether it is disposed of now or not. There have been some statements made to me in connection with it that I do not understand. I should like to have them explained by the committee.

I do not propose at this time to present any argument, but certain facts and figures were given to me last night in connection with the complaints that have been made as to the proposed amendments which I should like to present to the consideration of the Senate now, so that when these amendments are taken up the facts will be before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. ALLISON. We passed them over temporarily, and I suggest to the Senator that these amendments be now considered, so that we may have the benefit of the information which the Senator from Arkansas will present.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. So far as I am concerned, I am ready to have them considered.

Mr. ALLISON. So are we.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Whether there are any other Senators who want them passed over I do not know.

Mr. ALLISON. Let them be considered now, so that we may have present in our minds the suggestions of the Senator from Arkansas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the amendments on page 14 will be considered as before the Senate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I stated yesterday to the chairman of the committee that I had been informed that there was complaint on the part of people who live between Rock Creek and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad as to the course of the committee and the Commissioners with respect to street improvements, etc., in their section of the city as compared with the section west of Rock Creek. I asked the Senator in charge of the bill whether the amendments on page 14 related to this question, and I understood him to say they did. Last night I had a statement made to me to which I will now call the attention of the Senate.

The claim is made that in the eastern section spoken of there is three and a half times more population than in the western section, according to the census; that the population of the western section is 6,803, and the population of the eastern section 25,736; that the assessed value in 1897 of the land and improvements in the eastern section is six times that of the western section; that the value of the land in the western section is \$3,327,896, and the value of the land in the eastern section \$14,073,523; that the building improvements for nine years to date in the eastern section have been over four times as great as in the western section; that the buildings in the western section in the last nine years have amounted to \$1,503,925, while the new buildings in the eastern section have amounted to \$6,442,820. The statement is made, however, that between 1893 and 1901 the appropriations for the construction of streets, county roads, etc., have been very much more in the western than in the eastern section.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. May I inquire of the Senator by what line he divides the city into eastern and western sections?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I stated in the beginning of what I am saying that the complaint was made to me that that part of the city lying between Rock Creek and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad had been discriminated against as compared with that part of the city lying west of Rock Creek, and that that part of

the city which I have designated as the eastern section has very much more population, that the building has been very much more rapid therein, that the amount of expenditures has been greater, that the amount of taxes has been greater, and yet that the appropriations have been largely in favor of the western section all the time.

I called the attention of the Senator from Iowa to this fact yesterday and asked him if the amendments on page 14 were the amendments that were covered by this complaint. The committee makes several divisions in the bill. One is designated as the Georgetown schedule. Another is the northwest schedule. Another is the southwest schedule, and another is the northeast schedule. I do not know how nearly they conform to this division that I speak of, which I characterize as the eastern and the western division.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him? I think perhaps I may make an explanation which may be of value to him in interpreting the paper which he has in his hand.

The provisions now under consideration relate wholly to street improvements in the cities of Washington and Georgetown. They do not in any sense relate to what are now known as county roads. In these bills a distinction is always drawn between those streets within the limits of the cities of Washington and Georgetown and those streets and roads outside of the city limits. So the schedules relate entirely to the cities of Washington and Georgetown.

If the Senator will turn to the provision, I will call his attention to these limits. He will see that the provision on page 14 does not relate very much, I think, to the criticism in that paper. We provide here in the first place \$160,000 to be expended in the discretion of the Commissioners on the streets and avenues. Those are streets and avenues in the cities of Washington and Georgetown, as provided in the Book of Estimates.

Now, if the Senator will turn to the Book of Estimates, he will see that in this Schedule Ee there is provided for streets, in the aggregate, \$527,000, and in the estimates of the District Commissioners, transmitted to us from the Treasury, upon this schedule there is recommended to be appropriated \$300,000, which, of course, is only a percentage of the amount involved in these streets, as shown upon the schedules. The total is \$160,000. The Georgetown schedule, under the total of \$160,000, amounts to \$10,080. That includes the streets in Georgetown under the old boundary limits of the city.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Where does that appear in the bill?

Mr. ALLISON. It appears on page 14, lines 16 and 17. For the northwest section schedule under our amendment the appropriation is \$49,120. The northwest schedule embraces all of the city of Washington lying west of North Capitol street and north of what is known as B street south of the avenue; the northwest section schedule provides for all of the streets in the most densely populated portion of the city, extending from North Capitol street to Rock Creek, or Georgetown. That is the northwest schedule.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That extends then, I understand, to the boundary, and not beyond the boundary?

Mr. ALLISON. It extends to the boundary on the north, to Rock Creek on the west, to B street south of the avenue on the south, and to North Capitol street on the east. For all that region, embracing, as the Senator will see, the great portion of the city of Washington, we have provided \$49,120.

The southwest section schedule provides for \$20,000. The southwest section schedule embraces all that portion of the city of Washington lying west of South Capitol street, which is the street running directly south from the Capitol, and lying south of B street, extending along the river front, and of course it contains relatively a very small population.

The southeast schedule is another schedule for which we have appropriated \$39,040. It embraces all that portion of the city of Washington lying south of East Capitol street and east of South Capitol street. In other words, it applies to all that region [indicating], if I may indicate it by motion of the hand. Then the northeast section schedule applies to all that portion of the city of Washington lying north of East Capitol street and east of North Capitol street, taking in all that region [indicating].

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Extending beyond the boundary or limited to the boundary?

Mr. ALLISON. All limited to the boundary. This entire schedule is limited to the boundary.

It will be seen that for the northeast and southeast, the two together being bounded by North and South Capitol streets, we have provided more than we have provided for all that portion of the city of Washington lying west of North and South Capitol streets. It seems to me, in making up these schedules—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I did not understand the last statement of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. The provisions for the southeast section and the northeast section together amount to \$39,000 and \$41,000—\$80,000—and for the northwest schedule, which includes all the

city west of North Capitol street and west of South Capitol street, we have provided only \$79,000. The division here is, in the first place, a line in this city running east and west of North and South Capitol streets. It seems to me, as it seemed to the committee in looking this over, that this division was a fair division between all the different portions of the cities of Washington and Georgetown, allowing \$10,000 for the city of Georgetown.

As I understand this paper—I have a copy of it, I will say to the Senator—it embraces what are called the east and west sections. The inquiry of the Senator from Connecticut was a very pertinent one, because it depends where you make the dividing line. If you take the west section of the District of Columbia, including the city and the country outside, you will find that there is a very much larger population than 6,805. The great bulk of the population of the city of Washington and in the District of Columbia lies west of North and South Capitol streets.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The reason why I made the inquiry was that we are apt to divide the city by North and South Capitol streets. When we speak of the eastern section it carries the idea of east of that and the other west of that; but that is not what the Senator from Arkansas means.

Mr. ALLISON. This paper does not so mean. It is true, I have no doubt, taking the division of North and South Capitol streets and including only that portion of the District of Columbia which lies outside of the city of Washington and Georgetown, that there has been expended considerably more money for county roads and streets outside of the city than there has been expended east of North Capitol street, and manifestly for the reason that the natural extension of the District of Columbia has been toward the northwest and not the north or the northeast, because on the north side of course we have, as we all know, public institutions of various characters.

As to the cities of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia, when we come to the pages farther along in the bill we will see that we have provided for a great number of what are known as county roads, although many of them are really streets. Some of them are designated as streets and others are designated as county roads, which are in fact streets. When we come to the appropriation for county roads outside of the city of Washington, the point made in the paper, of which the Senator has a copy, becomes a subject of fair criticism.

I desire to assure the Senator and his correspondent, whoever he may be, that the committee in these matters have been obliged very largely to rely upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and especially the Engineer Commissioner, who is absolutely familiar with every road and every street and what has been done upon a street or road and what ought to be done; and while it is true that much more ought to be done, perhaps, upon these county roads as well as upon the streets, it is impossible to complete all these roads in a single appropriation bill or to gratify the proper desires and wishes of all those people who dwell in the neighborhood of county roads and of these streets. I think a careful examination of the bill will show at least that we have done the best possible as respects the streets.

Mr. STEWART. Can the Senator give us any information as to where the large appropriations, which have involved the borrowing of money from the General Government, have been expended for the extension of streets?

Mr. ALLISON. The improvements have been largely made in the northwest portion of the city, although they have been made in both portions.

Mr. STEWART. They have been mostly east of Rock Creek?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, Rock Creek being taken as the east and west boundary.

Mr. STEWART. Pretty nearly all have been made there.

Mr. ALLISON. Not all, but nearly all east of Rock Creek.

Mr. STEWART. That expenditure, I understand, has been very large.

Mr. ALLISON. It has been very large in previous years.

Mr. STEWART. Pretty much all of that expenditure has been made east of Rock Creek.

Mr. ALLISON. Rock Creek can not be considered as defining the east and west divisions of the city or the different portions of the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator from Iowa is very clear, and I now understand what is the meaning of these schedules, which I did not understand when I asked him the question yesterday. Not being familiar with the District appropriation bill or with the Book of Estimates, I, of course, did not know about these expenditures, and I was asking for information. The early part of this paragraph, under the head of improvements and repairs, says:

For work on streets and avenues named in Appendix Ee, Book of Estimates, 1902, \$100,000.

I have not had time to add up the figures to see whether these amounts of \$10,080 and \$49,120, etc., which follow, make up the \$160,000.

Mr. ALLISON. They do. They are subdivisions of that amount.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then these items relative to the city proper, inside the boundary, do not relate to the matter of which I was speaking?

Mr. ALLISON. No.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator in what part of the bill the appropriation for that part of the city appears? I wish to say, in reply to the criticism of the Senator from Nevada and also in reply to the last statement of the Senator from Iowa, that I did not understand that anybody claimed that there had been a division by the law, of which Rock Creek was the line, but a man who lives east of Rock Creek, in the part of the District of Columbia outside of the boundary, claims that there have been discriminations against that section of the District of Columbia which lies outside of the boundary and between Rock Creek and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad as in favor of that part of the District of Columbia which lies west of Rock Creek. I can not see any reason why any man has not a right to institute comparisons between two sections of the District of Columbia in that way. I do not understand how the Senator from Nevada or the Senator from Iowa can conclude that a man who chooses to institute comparisons of that sort between two sections of the District of Columbia is off in his reckoning or is making any sort of erroneous calculation or estimate.

Mr. ALLISON. I did not mean to be so understood.

Mr. STEWART. Nobody made any such charge.

Mr. ALLISON. So far as I know, the improvements west of Rock Creek have been greater, perhaps, than they have been east of Rock Creek, outside of the boundary of the city of Washington.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is the complaint.

Mr. ALLISON. I am not sure about that.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The gentleman who prepared this statement never intended to say there were only 6,000 people in the city of Washington west of North and South Capitol streets. What he meant to say was that there were but 6,000 people, according to the census, in the District of Columbia outside of the city limits and between Rock Creek and the limits of the District of Columbia, and four times as many in that part of the District of Columbia that lies between Rock Creek and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad above the boundary.

I should like to know, if the Senator can tell me, in what part of the bill the appropriations are made for that part of the District of Columbia, as I should like to call attention to these matters when that point is reached.

Mr. ALLISON. It is now immediately to be read, beginning on page 17, "Construction of county roads." It will be found on pages 17 and 18, I believe.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Are the streets in the District of Columbia outside of the city limits proper all designated as county roads?

Mr. ALLISON. They have all been included within that general heading. If the Senator will follow, on page 18, the amendment suggested by the Senate Committee on Appropriations and also the original text of the bill, he will see all the contemplated improvements outside of the city of Washington and Georgetown, in the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I hope when that amendment is read it may be read so that we can keep in line with it and understand what it means, and that the amendments may be disposed of after all the paragraphs proposed to be inserted have been read. Disposing of paragraphs one by one, when members of the Senate are not capable of telling what their bearing is on the general proposition, is hardly fair.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice that in the bill as passed by the House the Georgetown schedule appropriation was \$6,300, and that the Senate committee amendment is \$10,080; for the northwest section schedule the House appropriated \$30,700 and the Senate committee gives \$49,120; for the southwest section schedule the House gave \$12,500 and the Senate committee proposes \$20,000; for the southeast section schedule the House gave \$24,400, while the Senate committee amendment makes it \$39,040; for the northeast section schedule the amount was \$26,100 in the House bill and it is made \$41,760 by the Senate amendment, making an increase in three items of \$56,000. I desire to ask the chairman if all those appropriations are within the estimates made by the District Commissioners, or are they beyond the estimates made?

Mr. ALLISON. They are all largely within the estimates made by the District Commissioners.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Was the amendment on page 17 passed over?

Mr. ALLISON. No. I ask that it may be read.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I understood the Senator to state when the amendment was read that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] perhaps raised some question about it yesterday, and he asked that it be passed over.

Mr. ALLISON. That is on page 17, relating to the sewage disposal. That amendment was passed over.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is what I thought.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are the amendments on page 14 to be considered now?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have no objection.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that they may be considered as agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. They were all agreed to. The reading of the bill will be resumed.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at page 17, line 22.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Construction of county roads," on page 18, line 3, after the word "road," to insert:

And of Park road, between Kenesaw avenue and Klinge Ford road, and of C street in the subdivision of Deanwood Heights.

So as to make the clause read:

For construction of county roads and suburban streets, as follows: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to change and adjust the line of Cincinnati street in the vicinity of Connecticut avenue, and of Warder avenue in the vicinity of Rock Creek Church road, and of Park road between Kenesaw avenue and Klinge Ford road, and of C street in the subdivision of Deanwood Heights, upon plans approved by them: *Provided*, That no expense is incurred thereby to the United States or the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 8, to strike out:

For Columbia road, widening and paving, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, after line 10, to insert:

For Blagden avenue, grading and macadamizing, \$10,000.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope these amendments will not be agreed to until the entire paragraphs have been read, so that the whole can be considered together.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that all the paragraphs down to line 20 on page 19 may be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The paragraphs will be read.

The SECRETARY. The committee report to insert, on page 18, after line 10, the following:

For Blagden avenue, grading and macadamizing, \$10,000.

For Elm street, Third to Fourth streets, NW., paving, \$3,500.

For Erie street between Champlain avenue and Sixteenth street, grading and macadamizing, \$2,500.

For Gale street, Fifteenth to Seventeenth streets, NE., paving, \$9,000.

For Pennsylvania avenue, Anacostia River to Minnesota avenue, grading and macadamizing, \$3,000.

For streets in Woodridge subdivision, grading and macadamizing, \$3,000.

For Connecticut avenue west of Rock Creek, grading and macadamizing, \$10,000.

For Columbia road west from Fourteenth street, paving, \$5,000.

For California and Wyoming avenues, Twenty-third, Twenty-fourth, and S streets, grading and macadamizing, \$5,000.

For Wisconsin avenue, grading and improving, \$15,000.

For Thirty-seventh street between New Cut road and Tennallytown road, and adjacent streets in Burleigh addition, grading and macadamizing, \$2,000.

For Illinois avenue, grading, \$5,000.

For Providence street, grading and macadamizing, \$2,000.

For Nebraska avenue, grading and macadamizing, \$4,500.

For Genesee street between Brightwood avenue and Fourteenth street road, grading, \$1,000.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] has suggested an amendment to the amendment which I think ought to be put in now. It comes in on page 19, line 6.

Mr. McMILLAN. On page 19, line 6, after the word "Twenty-fourth," I move to insert "Decatur," so as to read:

For California and Wyoming avenues, Twenty-third, Twenty-fourth, Decatur, and S streets, grading and macadamizing, \$5,000.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. On page 19, after line 19, I move the following amendment—

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator will withhold amendments covering new streets until the committee amendments have been disposed of.

Mr. McMILLAN. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee as amended.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if these are the provisions to which the memorandum applies of which he has a copy, as he has stated to the Senate, and which is in my hands? Are these the sections of the District to which complaints are addressed? I do not know enough about the streets to know whether that is the case or not.

Mr. ALLISON. These streets and county roads are scattered all over the District. Many of them are east and some of them are west. They are not so divided as that they can be easily distinguished, but I take it that the portion of the District east of Rock Creek is very well provided for in these amendments. I am not quite sure but that more than half of them are west or south of Rock Creek.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. An amendment was submitted, I presume, to the committee, proposing that \$100,000 shall be appropri-

ated for the bridging and grading of Sixteenth street extended. Was that before the committee?

Mr. ALLISON. Not in just that form.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The memorandum I have, of which the Senator says he has a copy, says at the very beginning:

And be it further enacted, That \$100,000 be, and hereby is, appropriated as aforesaid, to be expended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in opening, grading, and bridging Sixteenth street extended, where the same may be now dedicated or as hereinafter acquired.

Mr. ALLISON. I thought I had the same memorandum. I have not that memorandum. That question was before the committee, but it was not considered or urged at all by the District Commissioners. Sixteenth street extended is not yet completed, and the Commissioners desired nothing to be done on that street in this bill.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is exactly the ground of complaint on the part of the gentlemen who have been talking to me. They insist that this is a public work and that it ought to have the attention of the Commissioners. The ground of complaint is that there has been a continual discrimination by the committee and by the Commissioners against the section of the District through which Sixteenth street runs, that section of country between Rock Creek and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, as I stated a while ago, and the statements made by them would certainly seem to indicate that there is some ground for their complaint.

I had presented to the Senate a part of the statement and I will finish it now, as we have reached the part of the bill to which it applies. After showing that the population in the western section was 6,803 against a population of 25,736 in the eastern section—that is, assuming Rock Creek as the dividing line between those two sections of the District—and that the value of the land in the western section was \$2,327,896 against a value of \$14,073,520 in the eastern section, and after showing that in the last nine years new buildings have been erected in the western section to the value of \$1,503,925 against new buildings to the value of \$6,442,820 in the eastern section, the statement goes on to say that from 1893 to 1901 the appropriations for the construction of county roads, streets, etc., have been considerably more in the western section than in the eastern section, notwithstanding the fact that the population and assessed value of property is very much greater in the eastern section.

They make the further statement that the amount raised by taxation in the western section in nine years has been less than \$400,000, and that it has received for street and road construction and the erection of bridges \$456,538, more than the total amount of all the taxation of that entire section of the District of Columbia through the nine years, while on the eastern section there has been paid in taxes \$1,800,000 in the same period and there has been appropriated for similar purposes in that district only \$387,590 for street, road, and bridge construction.

Now, Mr. President, if that statement is true, it seems to me to make a showing that ought not to exist. If, where the people on the eastern section paid but \$400,000 of taxes, the Committee on Appropriations has appropriated for street construction and the construction of bridges \$456,000, and there has been \$1,800,000, paid in taxes in the eastern section while there have been but \$387,590 appropriated for street construction and road building, it would seem that it is unfair and unjust. The parts of the city that are building most and that are paying most taxes it would seem to me ought to have larger appropriations for the improvement of streets than the parts of the city where no such work is done.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President—

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLAN. Is it not true that more money has been expended in that very section for work on the streets than in all the rest of the District of Columbia put together, and is not the very fact that to-day the District government is under the necessity of borrowing money from the General Government because we have opened Sixteenth street, Sherman avenue, and Eleventh street right in the very section of which the Senator from Arkansas is speaking?

Mr. ALLISON. Sixteenth street, which seems to be the street complained of here, we have provided shall be opened up to the boundary from its intersection, I believe, with Columbia road, or rather from the present boundary, and there have been damages assessed there upon that street to the amount of \$854,000 by the people who own the land adjacent, and who have made us buy that widened Sixteenth street to the Boundary; and they ask us—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Where is that?

Mr. ALLISON. That is the street complained of—Sixteenth street.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. But the Senator just made a statement about opening Sixteenth street to the boundary. To the boundary from where?

Mr. ALLISON. From its present terminus. Sixteenth street now terminates on the hill, at Columbia road.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Beyond the boundary?

Mr. ALLISON. At Columbia road. Yes; largely beyond the boundary. We have expended immense sums already on Sixteenth street. We have proposed to open it up and widen it. The damages amount to \$854,000, and we were obliged, in order to meet that necessary expense, to pass a bill here the other day providing that the Government of the United States shall advance money to pay for the damages. They are exorbitant damages, in my judgment. They are exactions made by the people who own these streets in the county and who have compelled us to pay a large sum of money in excess of what we ought to have paid for the purpose of benefiting their property while we are seeking to open this street to the boundary of the District of Columbia.

That transaction is not yet closed. We have not the title to this street, and therefore we did not believe it wise, in advance of a settlement of that street, for us to appropriate money now for macadamizing, grading, etc., when there are so many other streets that are urged upon the committee by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as being more necessary to be improved at this time. This critic, whoever he may be, I have no doubt, is a good citizen in every way, but, like other good citizens, wants to advance his own interests.

We concluded not to insert anything for the extension of Sixteenth street, because there has been an amendment proposed to improve the street referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that committee, so far as I know, reported that amendment favorably to the Committee on Appropriations.

So my judgment is that our friend, whoever he may be, who is dealing with this question had better wait another year before he undertakes to ask us to improve Sixteenth street extended.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I did not understand that there was any proposition in what I had said to improve Sixteenth street. I understood the argument of the gentleman—and I will state to the Senator from Iowa that the gentleman who gives me this information is as reliable and honorable a gentleman as there is in the District of Columbia—

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. He is a perfectly truthful man.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. One of the criticisms he makes on the action of the committee relates back to a matter that we all remember, where a large amount of money was appropriated by the District here to buy what is called now the Zoological Park, I believe, or something of that sort, on Rock Creek. Large appropriations were made to buy that park, and it was understood that the assessments for betterment as to the surrounding property were to reduce the enormous amount of money paid for this property, and yet when the assessments came to be made it was ascertained that there were no betterments resulting from it, but so far from it having improved the adjacent property in any sense it had depreciated it; it had injured its value. There was, consequently, no contribution by the surrounding property owners toward the buying of that park, and the whole of it became a burden to the Government, while the understanding was when the measure was passed through the Senate and the House that a large part of it would be reimbursed to the Government by the assessments for betterments on account of the increased value of the adjacent property. It was a criticism of exactly that sort upon which this gentleman bases his criticism of the action of the committee in this connection.

Now, because there is some unfairness by the property owners on Sixteenth street between the top of the hill and the boundary is no reason why all the people who live clear out to the District line above the hill and between Rock Creek and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad should be discriminated against; and because unjust and unfair things may have been done—I do not know whether they have been done or not—is no reason why other people who live in other parts, or all the 25,000 people who live in that section of the city, should be discriminated against and no appropriations made to enable them to build roads and bridges and to improve their streets.

Mr. ALLISON. I agree with the Senator that that is no reason. Now, if the Senator will point out some street that he thinks has been discriminated against and that ought to be provided for that is not provided for and that has merit in it I shall be glad to consider it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The amendment which I read a while ago, and which has been suggested to me, related to Sixteenth street, and I supposed that was the cause of the criticism of the Senator from Iowa. Now, as I understand, this does not relate to the part of Sixteenth street to which the Senator alludes, but to a part of Sixteenth street beyond that, and I understand that

the property owners on both sides of that street have made a proposition that they will contribute whatever there is of damage to their property to the Government—everything is taken from them by condemnation proceedings and otherwise—they propose to make a donation of that to the Government if the Government will enter upon the improvement of that street at all.

There is a controversy, I understand, between where these people live and the city, and these people think that unfair discriminations have been made; that the persons owning the property adjacent to Sixteenth street in that section have probably made demands on the Government that they believe are unreasonable, but they themselves are perfectly willing to turn over the whole width of the street to the city if the city will enter upon any improvement at all. It makes the point stronger still that, because there has been unfairness, according to the statement of the Senator from Iowa, by citizens along a part of this street, there should be no discrimination against people at another part of the street, who propose not only to act fairly, but to act liberally toward the District and the Government.

Mr. ALLISON. Now, Mr. President, one word. The Senator will see that it is impossible for the Committee on Appropriations to visibly look into all these streets and avenues and questions of that sort. We must rely upon the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for proper information upon these subjects, and these people should make their appeal to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. So far as I know, and I believe, the District Commissioners are endeavoring to so restrict the amount of money that can properly be spared for the extension of streets in the different parts of the District of Columbia as to make it as nearly equitable as possible. That is my answer to the criticism.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yet, Mr. President, the Commissioners' estimates for the coming year, as the statement made in this same memorandum shows, for road construction in the western section, that is, for the section of the District lying west of Rock Creek, is \$230,000, while their estimate for the eastern section is \$123,500. I have just shown to the Senate that there are four times as many people living in the eastern section as in the western, that they are paying more than four times as much taxes in the eastern as in the western section, and that they are growing four times as rapidly as in the western section.

The Senator from Iowa says that the committee must rely on the District Commissioners. Then it is proper that the Senate should look into the action of the District Commissioners and see why they recommend the expenditure of \$123,500 in the eastern section, paying this large amount of taxes, with this much larger number of people, and recommend that there should be \$230,000 spent in the western section, with only one-fourth as many people. If reliance is made upon the reports of the District Commissioners, it seems that they ought to give some reason why they propose to expend this very much larger amount of money in the improvement of this comparatively sparsely settled section of the city as against the section of the city where there are many more people.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I do not think that is a correct statement as to the amount being \$123,000. We include only \$134,000 in this entire schedule—\$134,000 is the total amount. On looking over these amendments I see that very many of the streets named—I think a large majority of them—are east of Rock Creek.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. These figures are given to me by a man who I believe would not misrepresent the facts, and I think he is entirely competent to know what the truth is. He also states that for street extensions, purchase of right of way, in 1898, 1899, and 1901 there was expended in the western section \$341,000, and in the eastern section \$257,976, showing a very much larger amount of money for this purpose for the last three years appropriated in the western section than in the eastern section of the city.

For street extensions, purchase of right of way, in 1900 there was appropriated and condemned, but not disbursed, in the eastern section \$95,118, and there has been appropriated for the extension, purchase of right of way, for Sixteenth street and others in the eastern section and not yet condemned but \$433,391, which is the estimate. Most of this is still in litigation, which at best will postpone the application of this amount six months and may invalidate the entire appropriation.

The amount expended for repairs to county roads in nine years is, in the western section, \$66,642.85, and in the eastern section, \$164,823.83; which would seem to be a division somewhat in proportion to the amount of taxes paid by the two sections. But that is the only item in all these comparative statements of amounts expended and amounts proposed to be expended in these sections that seems to be at all fair as between the eastern and western sections. At the bottom of the statement is the following certificate:

The figures given in the above statement as to the population, assessments, building improvements, and appropriations and expenditures for streets, roads, and bridges were compiled by me. I am not personally interested in

the conclusions drawn from them in said statement, but having collected said information I believe it is correct in substance and that the same will be so found on further investigation.

JOHN A. SWEENEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 2d day of February, A. D. 1901.

OSCAR LUCKETT,

Notary Public, District of Columbia.

Now, Mr. President, my purpose in calling attention to this was to induce the Committee on Appropriations, if possible, to look into this charge of unfairness, to look into this charge of discrimination against the citizens living between Rock Creek and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad as compared with those citizens living west of Rock Creek. It seems to me they make a showing which discloses that there has been unfairness and discrimination. If the District Commissioners have been making unfair distribution between the two sections of the city I do not know anybody whose duty it is to compel a correction of it equal to the responsibility which the Committee on Appropriations has in this matter.

If I were more familiar with the question I would be glad to offer amendments to change the provisions; but I am not sufficiently familiar with the facts to warrant it. I can only call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact and express the hope that the committee may, before the bill is disposed of, do justice to that section of the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Without objection, the amendment of the committee as amended will be agreed to. It is agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 20, line 20, to increase the total appropriations for construction of county roads and suburban streets from \$84,800 to \$134,800.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 10 on page 20.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if it would be in order for me to offer an amendment at the end of the paragraph on page 20, after line 10?

Mr. COCKRELL. I understood that the amendments of the committee were to be acted upon first.

Mr. ALLISON. By unanimous consent, I will say to the Senator—

Mr. SCOTT. It is the amendment I gave notice that I would offer to the bill, and it was not put in by the committee.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say to the Senator from West Virginia that there is a unanimous-consent agreement that the committee amendments shall be first considered. Afterwards the whole bill will be open to amendment, and the Senator will have an opportunity then.

Mr. SCOTT. Very well.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9928) granting an increase of pension to H. S. Reed, alias Daniel Hull.

The message also announced that the House had passed, with an amendment, the bill (S. 2799) to carry into effect the stipulations of article 7 of the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 971) to divide Kentucky into two judicial districts.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 12333) to provide for the extension of the charters of national banks; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10899) to restore to the public domain a small tract of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona, asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHELDEN, and Mr. LITTLE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also requested the Senate to return to the House the bill (H. R. 5048) to confirm in trust to the city of Albuquerque, in the Territory of New Mexico, the town of Albuquerque grant, and for other purposes, with the amendment of the House thereto.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution No. 70, in relation to appointing a joint committee to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect on the 4th day of March next.

The message also announced that in compliance with concurrent resolution No. 70 the Speaker had appointed Mr. CANNON, Mr. DALZELL, and Mr. McRAE as the committee on the part of the House to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect on the 4th day of March next.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 11970) to authorize the Chattanooga and Gulf Railroad Company, of Alabama, to construct a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River, a navigable stream in Geneva County, Ala.; and it was thereupon signed by the President pro tempore.

PROMOTION OF COMMERCE AND INCREASE OF TRADE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 727) to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the unfinished business may be informally laid aside, that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside. Is there objection?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I do not like to object to this request, but at the same time we may as well understand what the actual situation is.

Nearly all the appropriation bills are yet to be passed. They are important and ought to be passed. The effect of this unanimous consent is simply to agree that the ship-subsidy bill, as it is called, the regular order, shall remain the regular order of the Senate. I am perfectly willing, and I think all the gentlemen on this side are perfectly willing, to give all the time that is necessary for the consideration of appropriation bills. We believe that we ought to go ahead as rapidly as possible with the appropriation bills. But if the purpose to keep the ship-subsidy bill before the Senate all the time is to result in the failure of some appropriation bills, and if it is the intention of Senators on the other side of the Chamber to keep the ship-subsidy bill before the Senate and push everything else out of the way, as notice was given here some time since that nothing was to yield the way to it, that everything is to be sacrificed to the passage of that bill, I think it is proper the country should know it.

It is proper that the country should understand that it is the intention of the Republican party to keep that bill here and undertake to force its passage through the Senate, even at the expense of setting aside the appropriation bills and preventing their passage. There are other important matters here that ought to be considered.

We are constantly told that there is danger of an extra session. The danger of an extra session comes more from the persistent effort to keep the subsidy bill before the Senate in disregard of the public interests, and paying no attention to the obligation upon this body to pass the necessary appropriation bills, to pass the bills reducing revenue, to pass the bills reducing taxation, and all those matters. I believe that they are matters of more public importance, that they are matters of graver public importance, than the subsidy bill, and that they ought to take precedence and be first disposed of.

The ship-subsidy bill is a Senate bill. If it passes this body it has to go to the House before it can become a law. It seems to me that there would be no effort to unduly force this bill before the consideration of the Senate if it were not for the fact that the Senators on the other side believe that with the concurrence of two or three men at the other end of the Capitol, any measure can be passed through that body in an hour or two without deliberation and without debate, and that if there was time there for fair consideration of the bill there would be no effort to pass it here.

Under these circumstances, I am not willing for one to agree to a unanimous consent that that bill shall remain the regular order of the Senate. Therefore I object to the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON. I move, then, Mr. President, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the bill named by him.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate as in Committee of the Whole resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13575) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill at line 11, on page 20. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations

was, under the head of "Streets," on page 20, line 23, after the word "collected," to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall not, after the passage of this act, permit or authorize any additional telegraph, telephone, electric-lighting, or other wires to be erected or maintained on any or over any streets, avenues, or public roads of the District of Columbia within the fire limits thereof, as now or hereafter established.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am not sure about the effect of this amendment, but I have heard some complaints regarding it. It may be that the amendment is in the line of what I think ought to be done. I will have to read it again in order to see. [After examining the amendment.] Mr. President, the amendment is in the line of what I think ought to be done, and I agree to it, so far as I am concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 7 on page 21.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 6 on page 21, after the word "reservations," I move to amend by inserting the word "Government;" so as to read:

For replacing and repairing sidewalks and curbs around public reservations, Government and municipal buildings, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 21, after line 7, to insert:

For constructing cement sidewalk around the United States Treasury building, \$7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 12, to increase the appropriation for "current work of repairs of county roads and suburban streets" from \$80,000 to \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 21, line 20, after the word "incidental," to insert "and contingent;" and in line 25, after the word "at," to strike out "eighteen" and insert "nineteen;" so as to make the clause read:

Sprinkling, sweeping, and cleaning: For sprinkling, sweeping, and cleaning streets, avenues, alleys, and suburban streets, including necessary incidental and contingent expenses, and work done under existing contracts, as well as hand work done under the immediate direction of the Commissioners without contract: *Provided, That whenever it shall appear to the Commissioners that said latter work can not be done under their immediate direction at 19 cents or less per thousand square yards, in accordance with the specifications under which the same was last advertised for bids, it shall at once be their duty to advertise to let said work under said specifications to the lowest responsible bidder, and if the same can not be procured to be done at a price not exceeding 20 cents per thousand square yards, they may continue to do said work under their immediate direction, in accordance with said specifications; \$155,000.*

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 12, after the word "and," to strike out "ninety-seven" and insert "ninety-five," and in line 13, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one thousand" and insert "two thousand five hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For cleaning snow and ice from cross walks and gutters, under the act approved March 2, 1895, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 19, after the word "incidental," to insert "and contingent;" so as to make the clause read:

Disposal of city refuse: For the collection and disposal of garbage; miscellaneous refuse and ashes from private residences in the city of Washington and the more densely populated suburbs; for collecting and disposing of dead animals and night soil in the District of Columbia, and for the payment of necessary inspection and incidental and contingent expenses, \$115,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 1, to increase the appropriation for the parking commission from \$22,500 to \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 11, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seventy-eight" and insert "ninety;" and on page 24, line 4, after the word "burning," to insert:

And provided further, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit the erection of such poles and the stringing of such overhead wires thereon, outside of the fire limits and east of Rock Creek, as may be necessary for the maintenance of incandescent electric lights.

Mr. GALLINGER. I know, Mr. President, that it is always an ungracious task to take exception to what the Committee on Appropriations decides after mature deliberation, and yet I feel constrained to enter my protest against the proviso found near the top of page 24, and a similar proviso at the bottom of that page and at the top of page 25, authorizing the erection of poles and the stringing of overhead wires over what I conceive to be probably more than one-half of the territory of the District of Columbia, and that legislation of this kind should be on an appropriation bill. As a member of the Committee on the District

of Columbia I have been cooperating with other members of that committee for several years to get rid of overhead wires and to cause in this District the conduit system—the underground-wire system—to be inaugurated.

We have been met by people who have insisted that the overhead-wire system ought to be allowed under certain restrictions and in certain territory of the District.

Mr. President, I am aware of the fact that it will be argued in reference to this amendment that the present proposition is to permit poles and wires to be erected outside of the fire limits in the country territory of the District; but to my mind that is not a valid reason why this legislation should be allowed. If we are to legislate on this subject, it should be by means of a bill introduced into the Senate and sent to the Committee on the District of Columbia, which committee has given a great deal of thought and attention to this matter. That committee in reference to this proposition seems to have been entirely ignored, and the Committee on Appropriations has thought it proper to incorporate this legislation into an appropriation bill. I see very serious objections to it. These country districts have now, I take it, the advantage of being lighted by gas lamps, which is as favorable a condition of things as exists in a great many of the small cities of the country. I do not apprehend that they are suffering very much from the condition that now exists; and it seems to me that this matter can well go over until the Committee on the District of Columbia can give it careful and painstaking consideration.

In view of that fact, Mr. President, I make the point of order that this is new legislation and is not properly a part of an appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the Chair rules upon the point of order, I desire to say a word.

Under existing conditions and the state of the laws of this District, it is impossible for any person outside of the fire limits of the District of Columbia to secure an incandescent electric light, or for the District Commissioners to authorize incandescent lights to be used in that portion of the District. There is an absolute prohibition.

It is also true, as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] says, that it is impossible to get conduits laid in different portions of the District. It is also true that under the present state of the law no conduit can be laid. The law now is that neither conduits can be laid nor overhead wires provided for outside of the fire limits of the city of Washington. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia estimated for this appropriation in the Book of Estimates, and asked for this extension. Therefore, I do not think the amendment is liable to the point of order. This bill is a bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia, and this is a provision for lighting the streets of the District of Columbia. So it seems to me that anything that relates to the lighting of the streets in the District, especially of the public ways, is within the province of the Committee on Appropriations to report upon.

This is an appropriation for incandescent electric lights and for gaslights. The gas companies of course can extend their pipes and lamps into any portion of the District, but the electric-light companies can not.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Without this provision, would it be possible for people living outside of the city limits to avail themselves of these lights?

Mr. ALLISON. It would not outside of the fire limits of the city.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Could not a modification be made to the provision that that should be done where the street improvements are not of such a character as to enable people to get electric lights by underground wires? As I understand, there are some streets outside of the city limits where the underground wires might be laid.

Mr. ALLISON. Underground wires might be laid outside of the city and within the fire limits, if the law did not prohibit it. I have an amendment which I intend to offer later to another provision of the bill, authorizing the laying of conduits within the fire limits, and outside of the limits of the city of Washington for the erection of telephones.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It would seem to me to be absolutely necessary, where that can not be done, that people should be allowed to have overhead wires; otherwise they would be deprived of light.

Mr. ALLISON. These two provisos are intended to authorize electric arc lights and incandescent lights outside of the fire limits of the District of Columbia. It seems to me a fair and proper thing, and a legitimate thing, as a condition of this appropriation bill, that what is now authorized in a part of the District may be authorized throughout the entire District in the expenditure of this appropriation.

Of course I have great respect for the Committee on the District of Columbia, and if they think that this ought not to be done, certainly we of the Committee on Appropriations have no

disposition to aggrandize the powers of that committee. If it is the judgment of the Committee on the District of Columbia, who have examined this subject with care, that a man who happens to reside in the District of Columbia outside of the fire limits should not have an opportunity of getting an electric light either in front of his door, on the streets over which he passes, or in his house, then the Committee on Appropriations would not desire to intrude.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if it is the policy of the Government to light the District of Columbia outside of the city proper?

Mr. ALLISON. I am unable to hear the Senator's question.

Mr. ALLEN. I asked, has the Government been in the habit of lighting the entire District of Columbia?

Mr. ALLISON. It has. This appropriation covers lights in the District of Columbia. It has been the policy of the Government to make no distinction between the District of Columbia and the city of Washington proper.

Mr. ALLEN. But does it cover outside of the corporate limits of the city of Washington? Does the Government recognize the entire District of Columbia within the 10 miles square and hold it to be its duty to light the whole District?

Mr. ALLISON. Within 5 miles square; within the limits of the District. The District is not now 10 miles square.

Mr. ALLEN. I say anywhere within the District of Columbia. Does the Senator hold it to be the duty of the Government to light that territory outside of the corporate limits of the city?

Mr. ALLISON. I hold it to be the duty of the government of the District of Columbia to provide lights where it is necessary to provide them, whether within the limits of the city of Washington or within the limits of the District of Columbia. A large part of the District of Columbia outside of the city of Washington is quite thickly and densely populated.

Mr. ALLEN. But why should they not light it themselves, the same as any other city or town or village in the United States?

Mr. ALLISON. The expenditures for lighting are applied in this District as expenditures for roads and streets are applied, and every other District expenditure.

Mr. ALLEN. I understood that, but I think it only proper that the Government should bear a ratable portion of the expenses of lighting the city proper—that is, within the corporate limits; but I doubt very much whether the Senator from Iowa is able to give the answer why the Government should light that portion of the District outside of the city.

Mr. ALLISON. That has been the settled policy.

Mr. KENNEY. May I ask a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. KENNEY. Is it not true that, while the people living in the part of the District lying outside of the corporate limits of the city of Washington, are taxed and pay their taxes into the general Treasury—

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. KENNEY. And are, therefore, entitled to as many benefits from the Government as the people inside the corporate limits?

Mr. ALLISON. That is in accordance with the law of this District, I will say to the Senator, and has been the rule since 1874.

Mr. ALLEN. I have no doubt of that, but, with the Senator's permission, there are a great many laws that are not good laws, and the sooner they are repealed the better off the people will be after they are repealed.

Mr. ALLISON. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. ALLEN. A bad law never furnishes a good precedent for another law. If a law is wrong in principle, as this certainly is—for I do not think anyone can justify it—it ought to be repealed and a new order of things ought to be instituted. I fully concur in the idea that the Government of the United States ought to care for its capital. It is the capital city. Congress ought to be liberal and generous, as it has been in the past, and as I have no doubt it will be in the future; but ever since I have been here I have heard this argument made every time the question came up for consideration on an appropriation bill; and it is no argument at all, that the Government owns half the property in this District, ergo, the Government ought to pay the taxes.

Mr. President, the property in this city derives its value from the fact that the Government is located here, and from the further fact that the Government expends millions and millions of dollars here. There is not a city in the Union, including the city in which my distinguished friend from Iowa lives—a beautiful little place of some forty or fifty thousand people—that would not duplicate these streets, that would not duplicate the public buildings, that would not give twice the ground that the Government owns here, pay all the taxes, and improve the streets and light them for the privilege of enjoying the location there of the capital of the nation. But I do not stand on that proposition. That seems to have passed into history, and I suppose the Government

is estopped, if sovereignty can be estopped at all, by the precedents of the past.

But, Mr. President, you might just as well run the electric lights out into Maryland, and from Maryland across into Virginia, and then out across the prairies to the Pacific slope, as to go beyond the corporate limits of the city of Washington and light these hills and valleys that are being improved for private profit, and for private profit alone.

I do not know that anything can be said that will stop it. Perhaps the virus has got into the blood; perhaps it must run its course; but it seems to me as though we had fallen upon an era of wild and indiscriminate throwing away of public funds and of imposing burdens upon the taxpayers of this country. I know of no reason why the people of this city should enjoy more privileges than the people elsewhere in the country. If a man comes to this city of Washington and deprives himself of citizenship with the purpose of living here and enjoying its beauties and its surroundings, that is a matter of choice with him.

But why should he be the special recipient of unusual favors, while the men who pay the taxes that improve these streets and that extend this electric-lighting system, that provide these magnificent public buildings—why should the taxpayer of the State of Delaware or of the State of Nebraska pay his hard-earned money for this purpose, so that these men should enjoy at his expense unusual and special privileges? Yet, I suppose, the real-estate ring in the city of Washington is so far above us, is so far above both branches of Congress and the government of the District of Columbia, that it says what appropriation is to be made, and whoever dare stand in this Chamber or in the other and protest against it is set down as an old fogey and one who is not up to modern ideas. I want, in my closing days of service, at least, to set my seal of condemnation upon this and all similar appropriations.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, a single word on the point of order. In the first place, I wish to disclaim any purpose of committing the Committee on the District of Columbia to any views that I have expressed. I spoke for myself entirely, as a member of that committee. I believe that a matter of this kind belongs to that committee, and ought to have had the consideration of that committee, which it certainly has not had.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] have made a suggestion that this is the only way in which the people outside of the fire limits of the District of Columbia can secure electric lighting; and hence the provision has an appropriate place on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CLAY. With the Senator's permission, I desire to ask him is it not true that these amendments are far-reaching and of importance? Now, let us see for just one minute what they mean. The proviso reads:

Provided further, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit the erection of poles and the stringing of wires thereon outside of the city of Washington, as in their judgment may be necessary for the maintenance of public electric arc lamps: *Provided further*, That said Commissioners are authorized to permit the erection of poles and the stringing of wires thereon on Brightwood avenue outside of the city of Washington, as in their judgment may be necessary for the maintenance of electric arc lamps: *Provided further*, That said Commissioners are hereby directed to investigate and report in detail to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session the cost of furnishing the arc lights herein provided for.

I desire to ask the Senator whether it is not true that this bill makes appropriations to provide for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, etc.; and is it not a fact that when this appropriation bill provides that the District Commissioners shall have the right to put up the poles, in their discretion, it interferes with property rights? Is not that a question which ought to have been considered in a separate measure by the Committee on the District of Columbia, and has it any place whatever in an appropriation bill? Is it not a grave question, one of vast importance, and one that affects property rights? And is it not true that it has no place whatever on an appropriation bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. That is precisely what I have been trying to make appear, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut in the chair). Will the Senator from New Hampshire state what his point of order is?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I was about to state it. I did state it in a general way, and I will state it somewhat more specifically now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would like to inquire whether it is that the amendment proposes general legislation, or whether it also includes the claim, that it is not relevant?

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator from Iowa suggests that this paragraph relates to the lighting of the streets of Washington, and, ergo, anything that pertains to the lighting of the streets of Washington is in order on this appropriation bill. The appropriation bill simply provides for lighting the streets of Washington under existing laws; but the amendments contemplate

making a change in existing laws—in other words, they make law. They make law which puts into the hands of the District Commissioners powers that they do not now possess and which they can only secure through law.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think this is an important question and the Senate ought to hear the discussion in relation to it. I therefore suggest that there is not a quorum present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich,	Clay,	Hoar,	Pettus,
Allen,	Cockrell,	Jones, Ark.	Platt, Conn.
Allison,	Daniel,	Kean,	Quarles,
Bacon,	Depew,	Kenney,	Scott,
Bard,	Dillingham,	Kyle,	Sewell,
Bate,	Dolliver,	McComas,	Shoup,
Berry,	Elkins,	McCumber,	Simon,
Beveridge,	Fairbanks,	McMillan,	Stewart,
Burrows,	Foraker,	Mallory,	Taliaferro,
Butler,	Frye,	Martin,	Teller,
Caffery,	Gallinger,	Money,	Turley,
Carter,	Hanna,	Nelson,	Turner,
Chandler,	Hansbrough,	Perkins,	Wellington,
Clapp,	Hawley,	Pettigrew,	Wetmore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the Senate discloses the presence of 56 Senators. A quorum is present.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, when the call was ordered I was calling attention to the fact that this paragraph provides for lighting the streets of the city of Washington under existing laws, and I was impressed by the suggestion made by the Senator from Georgia, that the very title of this bill would exclude the provisions to which I make objection. It is a bill "making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902," and is not for the purpose of making new laws for the stringing of overhead wires and the erecting of poles in any part of the District of Columbia.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator permit me to call his attention to another part of this amendment, which I do not understand and which I think deserves explanation? In the first part of the amendment the Commissioners are authorized to permit the putting up of these poles and to provide for these arc lights. In the latter part of the amendment it is said:

That said Commissioners are hereby directed to investigate and report in detail to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session the cost of furnishing the arc lights herein provided for.

They are authorized to permit the putting up of the lights, and then they are requested to furnish, at the next session of Congress, information as to what they cost.

Mr. GALLINGER. Precisely. I do not wish to detain the Senate an unnecessary moment, but I wish specifically to say that the point of order I make is not that these provisions are irrelevant, but that they are obnoxious to the rule, on the ground that they propose general legislation on an appropriation bill. That is my point of order.

Mr. MCCOMAS. Mr. President, to the point of order made by the Senator from New Hampshire, I should like to add that the provision on page 24 is not only subject to the objection that it is new legislation, but that it is a direct repeal without reference to existing law. There are upon appropriation acts and elsewhere prohibitions of the stringing of overhead wires in the part of the city here described, outside of the fire limits and east of Rock Creek, for any purpose whatever. The amendment would repeal, without proper terms of repeal, the settled policy of Congress to prevent the use of overhead wires. If it is to be done, it ought to be provided for by the use of the existing conduits by a general policy. Congress had some years ago a system. The Rosewater Commission reported to a degree, suggesting that we use the other conduits, whereby the arc lights might be attached to poles at the corners of the streets. If this thing is to be done at all, it ought to be done in that way. Under this system the streets of Washington and the sky are not threatened and crowded by a mass of wires, as are the streets of other cities. Out on the hills beyond the boundary, in the absence of prohibition, they have begun to make a forest of poles and a network of wires. It ought to be stopped. There ought to be a mode of underground conduits and a system of supports for the arc lights.

As has been suggested here, it is proposed to string wires and to put up poles and then to inquire if it ought to be done and investigate and report on the cost of putting arc lights upon the poles there. It does seem to me that it ought not to be done now in any way. It ought not to be done on this appropriation bill. It ought not to be done until after an investigation. I am confident that this amendment is in contravention of existing law. It is a repeal of existing law, and upon every ground it is out of order,

as it is not a careful and provident public policy in respect to the streets of this city and the outlying streets beyond the Boundary to which the uniform system ought to be extended of not having clouds of wires and forests of poles.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. President, on the line of what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has said, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the last lines of the amendment on page 25, which read as follows:

That said Commissioners are hereby directed to investigate and report in detail to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session the cost of furnishing the arc lights herein provided for.

It seems to me a fair interpretation of that provision of the amendment supports the contention of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, that this matter ought by all means to be submitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that the question as to cost and the necessity of establishing these wires outside of the fire limits should be investigated by the Committee on the District of Columbia, and some understanding had by that committee upon such examination which should be given to the Senate before any such provision as this amendment proposes is adopted. I contend that the amendment proposes general legislation, and is not in order for that reason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it is not a question entirely free from difficulty, but is inclined to the opinion, and therefore holds, that the amendment is not in order.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not appeal from the decision of the Chair, but I wish to make a single remark about it. The people who live west of Rock Creek have incandescent and arc lights authorized. The committee believed that the general policy as respects lighting west of Rock Creek should prevail throughout similar parts of the District of Columbia. We had no desire in the slightest degree to infringe upon the rule which prohibits legislation on an appropriation bill. I can only regret for the people who live outside of the fire limits of the city of Washington that they have not the same opportunity if they live east of Rock Creek that they would have if they lived west of Rock Creek.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 24, line 12, before the word "thousand," to strike out "sixty-three" and insert "seventy;" and in line 13, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "eighty;" so as to read:

For electric arc lighting, including necessary inspection, and for extensions of such service, not exceeding \$70,000: *Provided*, That not more than \$80 per annum shall be paid for any electric arc light burning from fifteen minutes after sunset to forty-five minutes before sunrise, and operated wholly by means of underground wire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert after the word "Washington," in line 20, page 24, the following additional provisos:

Provided further, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to permit the erection of poles and the stringing of wires thereon outside of the city of Washington, as in their judgment may be necessary for the maintenance of public electric arc lamps: *Provided further*, That said Commissioners are authorized to permit the erection of poles and the stringing of wires thereon on Brightwood avenue outside of the city of Washington as in their judgment may be necessary for the maintenance of electric arc lamps: *Provided further*, That said Commissioners are hereby directed to investigate and report in detail to Congress at the beginning of the next regular session the cost of furnishing the arc lights herein provided for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This amendment is of the same character as the one held to be out of order, and the same rule applies to it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Is it ruled out of order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Are other amendments now in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Individual amendments will not be in order until the bill is read for committee amendments.

Mr. KENNEY. I understand the Chair to rule that the amendment on the bottom of page 24 and the top of page 25 is the same as the amendment on page 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are identical in their nature.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 25, after line 13, to insert:

For night crew for harbor boat and miscellaneous expenses, \$4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Bridges," on page 26, line 11, to increase the appropriation toward the construction of a bridge across Rock Creek, on the line of Connecticut avenue extended, from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I desire to move that the two items just read by the Secretary, beginning in line 6 and extending to line 11, on page 26, be stricken out. One provides for the completion of a bridge across Rock Creek at Massachusetts avenue and the

other at Connecticut avenue. I wish to move that they be stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks that the motion is not in order at the present time, because only committee amendments are being considered.

Mr. WELLINGTON. If it is not in order at the present time, will I have the privilege later of making the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will certainly be in order when the bill comes into the Senate.

Mr. WELLINGTON. I will defer the motion until that time.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall not object to the Senator offering his amendment as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the present time?

Mr. ALLISON. As in Committee of the Whole later, when the committee amendments shall have been disposed of.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Of what does the Senator from Maryland give notice?

Mr. COCKRELL. He will have the right to make that motion as soon as we get through with the committee amendments.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is a motion to strike out what?

Mr. COCKRELL. To strike out lines 6 to 11, on page 26.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 27, line 12, to increase the number of teachers of the public schools from 54 to 58.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 17, before the word "of," to strike out "supervising principal" and insert "director;" so as to make the clause read:

For director of manual training, \$2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 22, before the word "one," to strike out "numbered" and insert "number;" so as to make the clause read:

For principal of manual training school No. 1, \$1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 23, before the word "normal," to insert "white;" in the same line, after the word "school," to strike out "numbered one;" in line 24, before the word "normal," to insert "colored," and in the same line, after the word "school," to strike out "numbered two;" so as to make the clause read:

For principal of white normal school and principal of colored normal school, 2, at \$1,600 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 8, before the word "of," to strike out "principal" and insert "assistant director;" in line 9, before the word "two," to strike out "numbered" and insert "number;" in line 10, after the word "in," to strike out "ironwork" and insert "shopwork;" in line 12, before the word "principals," to strike out "ten" and insert "twenty-eight," and in line 13, before the word "in," to strike out "thirty-three" and insert "fifty-one;" so as to make the clause read:

For director of music, director of drawing, assistant director of drawing, director of physical culture, assistant director of manual training school No. 2, first assistant teacher of manual training, 2 normal training teachers, instructor in shopwork, assistant instructor in ironwork, instructor in free-hand drawing, 12 high-school teachers, and 23 principals of buildings, 51 in all; at \$1,200 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 18, to reduce the number of teachers at \$1,000 each from 89 to 73.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 3, to increase the number of teachers at \$800 each from 33 to 34.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 1, to increase the total appropriation for salaries of teachers for the public schools from \$878,575 to \$884,975.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 25, before the word "hundred," to strike out "five" and insert "six;" so as to make the clause read:

For care of * * * the Adams, Addison, Ambush, Amidon, Anthony, Bowen, Arthur, Banneker, Bell, Blair, Blake, Bradley, Brent, Briggs, Brightwood, Brookland, Bruce, Buchanan, Carberry, Congress Heights, Corcoran, Cranch, Douglass, Fillmore, Garrison, Giddings, Eckington, Greenleaf, Harrison, Hayes, Hilton, Hubbard, Jackson, Johnson, Jones, Lenox, Logan, Lovejoy, McCormick, Madison, Magruder, Maury, Monroe, Morse, Patterson, Payne, Phelps, Phillips, Pierce, Polk, Slater, Smallwood, Taylor, Tenley, Toner, Towers, Twining, Tyler, Van Buren, Webb, Weightman, Wilson, Wormly, building in third division, building in fourth division, building in seventh division (Washington Heights), building in tenth division, building in eleventh division, 67 in all, at \$600 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 3, before the word "dollars," to strike out "two hundred and fifty" and insert "three hundred and sixty;" so as to make the clause read:

Of the Garfield, Hillsdale, Thompson, Van Buren annex, and Woodburn buildings, 5 in all, at \$900 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 6, after the word "Park," to insert "Twining City;" in line 7, before the word "in," to strike out "twelve" and insert "thirteen;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred and sixty-five" and insert "two hundred and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

Of the Bennings (white), Bennings (colored), Chevy Chase, Hamilton, High Street, Langdon, Kenilworth, Petworth, Potomac, Reservoir, Takoma Park, Twining City, and Threlkeld buildings, 13 in all, at \$240 each.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, line 19, to increase the total appropriation for janitors and care of buildings and grounds from \$73,756 to \$82,143.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 2, to insert:

For replacing old boilers in school buildings where needed, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 10, to increase the appropriation for furniture for and equipment of manual training school No. 1 from \$20,000 to \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 12, to increase the appropriation for furniture for and equipment of manual training school No. 2 from \$30,000 to \$37,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 1, after the word "dollars," to insert "Twining City, \$825;" and in line 3, before the word "dollars," to strike out "and twenty-five" and insert "eight hundred and fifty;" so as to make the clause read:

For furniture for new school buildings and additions to buildings, as follows: Lovejoy, 8 rooms, \$1,650; Birney, 8 rooms, \$1,650; building in fourth division, \$1,650; building in seventh division, \$1,650; building in tenth division, \$1,650; building in eleventh division, \$1,650; building in second division, 12 rooms, \$2,475; Petworth, 4 rooms, \$825; Kenilworth, \$825; Twining City, \$825; in all, \$14,850.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 8, before the word "hundred," to strike out "thirty thousand six" and insert "thirty-four thousand five;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses, including furniture, books, books of reference, and periodicals, stationery, printing, insurance, and other necessary items not otherwise provided for, including maintenance of horse and carriage for the superintendent, \$34,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 17, after the word "dollars," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the board of education, in its discretion, is authorized to make exchanges of such books and other educational publications now on hand as may not be desirable for use.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to page 36, line 8.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I notice that the last paragraph reads:

For site for and toward the construction of one eight-room building, ninth division, to relieve Briggs and Stevens schools.

And so forth.

That seems to give a reason which justifies an appropriation, but the three former items seem to give no reason at all for making the appropriation and selecting a site. I should like to know what reason there is for the construction of the other three buildings. There evidently was a justification needed for the last item. Why is it not given for the other three, or are they built without any necessity for their construction?

Mr. ALLISON. I will accept the criticism of the Senator from South Dakota. I move to strike out the words "to relieve Briggs and Stevens schools."

Mr. PETTIGREW. But it does not seem to me that that helps the situation at all. Evidently the Briggs and Stevens schools need relieving, but what is the necessity for the other three?

Mr. ALLISON. Undoubtedly the growth of the school population.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Does the committee know anything about it? Is there a necessity for those buildings?

Mr. ALLISON. We know a good deal about it through the Commissioners and the report of the board of education. We know that they are in constant need of additional school room and schoolhouses. So great is the need that they asked for three or four more than we were willing to grant them and did grant them.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Of course, in a general way, we know that the population has increased.

Mr. ALLISON. We do.

Mr. PETTIGREW. But whether these localities are the correct places or not and whether the necessity exists is the question which I asked and the one on which I wish information. Evidently there ought to be a reason given for the last one, to relieve the Briggs and Stevens schools, but no one seemed to think there was any necessity for giving a reason for the others.

Mr. ALLISON. I have no doubt that the reason given here is a statement simply that the Briggs and Stevens schools are overcrowded, and these buildings will be in the same neighborhood or

in the same division, at least. I regret exceedingly that my eye did not fall upon that paragraph, or I should have moved before to strike out that clause.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have no objection to its being stricken out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand the Senator from Iowa to move to amend?

Mr. ALLISON. I will move to amend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "division," line 4, page 36, strike out the words "to relieve Briggs and Stevens schools."

Mr. ALLISON. That does not seem to be necessary to the appropriation, Mr. President.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETTIGREW. There does not seem to be much information on this subject.

Mr. ALLISON. The clerk of the committee has called my attention to the Book of Estimates as respects the Stevens School:

In the Stevens building there are 18 rooms, accommodating 25 schools, 8 of the latter being half-day schools in the second and third grades. In the Briggs building, to prevent placing the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades on half time, it was found necessary to transfer the third and fourth grades to another building distant from the residences of the pupils.

That is the reason as respects these two schools. If the Senator will look at the Book of Estimates, he will see a statement as to every one of them.

Mr. PETTIGREW. But is there any statement which shows that the four-room addition to the Taylor School is not necessary?

Mr. ALLISON. The reason given in the note is that—

This building lies in the heart of the congested district to be relieved, in part, by the eight-room building at Trinidad or vicinity.

That is another school already provided for.

Mr. PETTIGREW. So the committee thought that it was not necessary to retain it?

Mr. ALLISON—

A small rented annex is now occupied, furnishing poor accommodations to the pupils crowded out of the Taylor School.

We believed that a school building should be built first, and then we can see what is necessary afterwards, and so struck it out. Indeed, the Commissioners recommended that it should be stricken out.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 36, after line 8, to strike out—

For four-room addition to Taylor School, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 15, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-six;" so as to make the clause read:

For one four-room building and site, Good Hope, eighth division, \$26,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 17, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twenty-six;" so as to make the clause read:

For one four-room building and site, Brookland (colored), seventh division, \$26,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 19, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

For one four-room building, seventh division, Grant road, \$25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 2, to insert:

For additional amount for one four-room school building, Petworth, seventh division, \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 4, to insert:

For additional amount for one four-room school building, eighth division, \$6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, after line 6, to insert:

For additional amount for one four-room school building, Kenilworth, \$8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 14, after the word "purposes," to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, in case they shall consider the bids received for the construction of any of the school buildings herein provided for to be in excess of a reasonable amount, are hereby authorized to construct such building or buildings by day labor and the purchase of material in open market, if the same can be completed within the amount appropriated or authorized therefor.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to know what is the necessity for the amendment of the committee inserting this proviso?

Mr. ALLISON. The statement of the Commissioners is that last year all the bids for these school buildings were higher than the appropriation, and they had some reason to believe that there

were combinations which ought not to exist as respects school buildings authorized. They asked us to insert this proviso as a check upon bidders for school buildings authorized in this bill, and we inserted it at their request, believing that it might in some way induce sharper competition. It is an experiment, I agree.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It is unusual.

Mr. ALLISON. And it is unusual in a District appropriation bill. It appertains to many other places.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I know we required in the Indian Service advertisement always for over \$3,000, and here are several hundred thousand dollars to be expended.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true in the Indian service. It is not true in the War service, however.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I know a great many shameful scandals have grown up as a result of it in the service. I am afraid we will get into the same difficulty in this District. It seems to me that there ought to be advertisement and plenty of notice.

Mr. ALLISON. They are bound to advertise. Of course, if they think the bids are too high they have authority to reject them all; otherwise they would have authority to reject none of them. This provision may not apply to any of these bids, but it may apply to one or two of them.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I think it is a dangerous thing to do; it seems so to me.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow this amendment to be passed over, I will look into it with care. It may be that it can be stricken out later on, though I think there is no danger of any abuse under it. That is my impression.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I think we have had, as a rule, an excellent government in the District, and I hope it will continue. I believe the system is a good one. I am very much afraid of giving this latitude and free hand to expend this money; there is such a chance for extravagance, if not corruption, to be exercised.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know very well how there can be any great extravagance here, because the appropriations for each of the school buildings is a gross one.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I know, but the character of the work, etc., makes a vast difference in the material, the supervision, and all that. The question is whether the Commissioners can give that detailed attention that is necessary to protect the public interest. I will not make the point of order against this amendment, although it is subject to it.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think it is subject to it. I think that we have a right to direct the appropriation. I hope the Senator will allow it to stand, and we will look into it further.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment was, on page 37, line 25, after the word "District," to strike out "and the board of education;" so as to make the clause read:

That the plans and specifications for school buildings shall be prepared under the supervision of the inspector of buildings of the District of Columbia, and shall be approved by the Commissioners of the District, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "For Metropolitan police," on page 38, line 11, to increase the number of lieutenants from 3 to 4; and on page 39, line 13, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Metropolitan police from \$691,580 to \$693,080.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 18, before the word "thousand," to strike out "eight" and insert "ten;" so as to make the clause read:

To enable the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to provide transportation and a suitable place for the reception, transportation, and detention of the children under 16 years of age, and in the discretion of the Commissioners of girls and women over 16 years of age, arrested by the police on charge of offense against any law in force in the District of Columbia, or held as witnesses, or held pending final investigation or examination, or otherwise, \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary: *Provided*, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "For the fire department," on page 41, line 2, before the word "assistant," to strike out "two" and insert "three;" in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eight hundred and forty" and insert "nine hundred;" in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eight hundred and forty" and insert "nine hundred;" in line 10, before the word "dollars," to strike out "eight hundred and forty" and insert "nine hundred;" and in line 14, before the word "hundred," to strike out "thirty-seven thousand five" and insert "forty-one thousand four;" so as to make the clause read:

For chief engineer, \$2,000; 3 assistant chief engineers, at \$1,200 each; clerk, \$1,000; fire marshal, \$1,000; machinist, \$1,000; 24 foremen, at \$1,000 each; 14 engineers, at \$1,000 each; 14 firemen, at \$900 each; 6 tillermen, at \$900 each; 25 drivers, at \$900 each; 166 privates, at \$840 each; 24 watchmen, at \$900 each; and 1 laborer, at \$480; in all, \$241,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 19, to increase the appropriation for repairs to apparatus and new appliances to engine houses from \$4,500 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 20, to increase the appropriation for purchase of hose for engine houses, from \$9,000 to \$11,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 5, to increase the total appropriation for miscellaneous expenses of the fire department from \$54,500 to \$57,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 9, to insert:

For house, lot, and furniture for a truck company to be located in southeast Washington, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 15, to increase the total appropriation for the increase of the fire department from \$30,000 to \$50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Electrical department," on page 42, line 19, after the word "dollars," to insert "draftsman, \$1,200;" and on page 43, line 2, before the word "hundred," to strike out "fifteen thousand two" and insert "sixteen thousand four;" so as to make the clause read:

For superintendent, \$1,600; inspector of lamps, \$1,000; electrician, \$1,200; draftsman, \$1,200; 3 telegraph operators, at \$1,000 each; 3 inspectors, at \$900 each; 3 telephone operators, at \$900 each; expert repairman, \$960; 3 repairmen, at \$720 each; 2 laborers, at \$400 each; in all, \$16,420.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 10, to increase the appropriation for general supplies, repairs, new batteries and battery supplies, telephone rental and purchase, etc., in the electrical department of the District, from \$12,000 to \$14,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 19, after the word "board," to insert "50 new boxes;" so as to make the clause read:

For extension of the fire-alarm telegraph in order to provide for additional circuits in connection with new 30-circuit board, 50 new boxes, \$6,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Health Department," on page 44, line 23, before the word "sanitary," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" in line 24, after the word "inspectors," to insert "one of whom shall be a veterinary surgeon," and on page 45, line 2, before the word "hundred," to strike out "forty-two thousand seven" and insert "forty-three thousand six;" so as to make the clause read:

For health officer, \$3,500; 14 sanitary and food inspectors, at \$1,200 each; sanitary and food inspector, who shall also inspect dairy products, and shall be a practical chemist, \$1,600; sanitary and food inspector, who shall be a veterinary surgeon, and act as inspector of live stock and dairy farms, \$1,200; inspector of marine products, \$1,200; chief clerk and deputy health officer, \$1,800; clerk, \$1,400; 4 clerks, 2 of whom may act as sanitary and food inspectors, at \$1,200 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each; clerk, \$600; messenger and janitor, \$600; pound master, \$1,200; laborers, at not exceeding \$40 per month, \$1,920; ambulance driver, \$480; sanitary and food inspector, who shall be a veterinary surgeon, \$900; 4 sanitary and food inspectors, one of whom shall be a veterinary surgeon, to assist in the enforcement of the milk and pure-food laws, at \$900 each; in all, \$43,600.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to modify the amendment in line 23, by striking out "three" before the words "sanitary and food inspectors," and inserting "five."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does not that change the total?

Mr. ALLISON. That will add \$900 to the total. I ask the clerks to make the change.

The SECRETARY. In line 1, on page 45, before the word "hundred," strike out "forty-two thousand seven," and insert "forty-four thousand five," so as to read:

In all, \$44,500.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 11, before the word "thousand," to strike out "ten" and insert "thirty;" and in line 12, after the word "dollars," to insert "to be immediately available;" so as to make the clause read:

For the enforcement of the provisions of the act to prevent the spread of scarlet fever and diphtheria in the District of Columbia, approved December 20, 1890, and the act to prevent the spread of contagious diseases in the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1897, under the direction of the health officer of said District, \$30,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 13, to increase the appropriation for maintaining the disinfecting service of the District from \$4,000 to \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Courts," on page 46, line 19, to increase the appropriation for the salaries of two deputy clerks in the police court from \$1,000 each to \$1,200 each, and in line 24, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the police court from \$19,840 to \$20,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Rock Creek Park," on page 48, line 13, before the word "thousand," to strike

out "twenty-five" and insert "fifty;" so as to make the clause read:

For care and improvement of Rock Creek Park, to be expended under the direction of the board of control of said park, \$50,000.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, as the House only appropriated \$25,000 for this purpose, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations proposes to double it, I think there should be some explanation made for the increase.

Mr. ALLISON. The estimates for this park, I believe, are in excess of \$50,000. I do not remember the exact amount; but there are certain streets or avenues in the park, carriage ways and bridges, which are necessary to be built, and ought to be built, for the improvement and use of that park. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia think that \$50,000 is a reasonable sum for that purpose, and the Committee on Appropriations agreed to increase the appropriation as proposed in the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It seems the House of Representatives thought a reasonable sum was \$25,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I know; but we always look over these propositions from the House, and sometimes change them.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Generally they are made larger. Where is it contemplated to make new bridges in the park?

Mr. ALLISON. I think there are two small bridges being built over Rock Creek. This is a very beautiful park, I am told—I have not had time to visit it myself within the year—and this appropriation is for the completion of certain roads in the park.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I think it ought to be a beautiful park considering the amount of appropriations that have been made for its improvement.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it ought to be.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The understanding was at the time the appropriation was first made for this park that a part of the expenditure, at least, should be paid by the adjacent property owners, which has not been done, as I understand, but the whole thing has been done at the expense of the public funds.

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate recommended the amount proposed in the estimate upon the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who said this sum was necessary this year.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The same argument ought to have been good in the committee of the other House, it seems to me.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Committee on Appropriations on this proposition. I think we ought to be very liberal in our appropriations for this magnificent park, which is attracting the attention of people from all parts of the country.

I want in this connection to say that when we stop to consider the amount of money we have spent on what is called the Botanic Garden, in the city of Washington, which is a burlesque, in my mind, on what a garden of that kind ought to be, we ought to be very liberal in making appropriations for this beautiful and magnificent park, which is a delight to every one who visits it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If unwise expenditures have been made for the Botanic Garden, that ought not to justify extravagant expenditures for other places; and if there has been an unwise expenditure for the Botanic Garden, I think it ought to be cut down. Is that provided for in this bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not.

Mr. ALLISON. There has been no expenditure of any amount in this park for roads and bridges, and the Commissioners have under construction a road through the park. A portion of it has been macadamized, and with this appropriation they will be able to macadamize and complete the whole of it. I think it is a very proper appropriation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I want to make an additional observation, so that I may not be misunderstood as to the Botanic Garden. I think that what is needed, so far as that garden is concerned, is the expenditure of more money on it, so as to modernize it. It is not creditable, as I view it, to this great national capital. It is out of date, and it is not kept up so as to compare with the Public Garden of Boston or any other of the public gardens in the great cities of the country. It is located within sight of the Capitol, almost within a stone's throw of it, and I have never been able to discover that there is anything about it which makes it "a thing of beauty" or "a joy forever" to anybody who may have occasion to visit it.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. President, this expenditure for the Rock Creek Park of \$50,000 is simply for roads and bridges across the stream of Rock Creek. There is one bridge there now, a temporary bridge, which it was necessary to provide, and which ought to be replaced as soon as possible. A part of this money will go to the building of that bridge.

There are one or two other bridges which were washed away during the flood last year. They were temporary bridges, and ought to be replaced by permanent bridges. I think it will require the full sum of \$50,000 to complete the roads and bridges which are to be built. The money will be well expended. It will only be

possible to see the park when these roads and bridges shall have been built through it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Charities and corrections," on page 49, line 14, after the word "clerk," to strike out "and stenographer;" in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "stenographer, \$900;" in line 16, after the word "dollars," to insert "two inspectors, at \$720 each;" in line 17, after the word "dollars," to insert "contingent expenses, \$500;" and in line 19, before the word "dollars," to strike out "four thousand eight hundred" and insert "seven thousand six hundred and forty;" so as to make the clause read:

Board of charities: For secretary, \$3,000; clerk, \$1,000; stenographer, \$900; messenger, \$900; two inspectors, at \$720 each; traveling expenses, \$200; contingent expenses, \$500; in all, \$7,640.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, this seems to be doubling the force for charities and corrections. I presume the law as it now stands provides for a secretary, a clerk, a stenographer, and a messenger. This amendment proposes to provide for a secretary, a clerk, a stenographer, a messenger, two inspectors, and then makes different appropriations for traveling and contingent expenses. The House of Representatives seemed to be entirely satisfied with the force as already organized and made an appropriation thereof of \$4,800. The Senate committee proposes \$7,640, almost doubling the number of persons necessary to discharge the duties of these positions. If the force was considered sufficient by the House of Representatives at the time the appropriation was made, it does seem to me that this expense ought not to be doubled in this way without some good reason being given for it.

Mr. ALLISON. The board of charities is a board which has been but recently organized. It was authorized by law last year. It has control and direction over all the charities in this District and over all the expenditures provided for in this bill for charitable purposes.

The board is composed of highly respectable and philanthropic people of this city, who do not receive any compensation for their services. The chairman of the board, Mr. John Joy Edson, stated to us that the force proposed to be provided by the Committee on Appropriations is absolutely necessary in order that the board might execute the law. As this is a new provision, the Senate Committee on Appropriations believe that the board should have sufficient force to enable them to execute the law passed last year.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Who discharged these duties before the organization of the present board?

Mr. ALLISON. The duties were discharged by various persons. A portion of this work was never done before by anybody. We appropriated \$10,000 for charitable institutions, and they took the money and spent it. That had been the rule here for a good many years. No doubt the money was economically and wisely expended for the purposes for which it was appropriated; but Congress thought it a wise thing to consolidate these charities and have some supervision over the whole of them. So last year, as I have said, we passed a law providing for a board of charities in this District, who should serve without compensation, and imposed upon them certain duties.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I will say that that legislation was the result of a very painstaking inquiry on the part of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLISON. I remember that, and the committee have had printed a very valuable document giving full information as to all the charities in this District. The result of their investigations was the passage of a law which authorized the creation of the board of charities.

I can assure the Senator from Arkansas that, from the investigation we were able to make, we became satisfied that this increase was absolutely necessary if the board is to discharge its duties properly.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. My objection to this sort of legislation is that it seems, after an exhaustive examination on the part of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the committee finding that it was necessary to have a board to supervise the disbursement of the money that was appropriated for charitable purposes, and finding that it was necessary to have a secretary, a clerk, a stenographer, and a messenger, as soon as the organization gets to work it is necessary to double the force, and instead of having a secretary, a clerk, a stenographer, and a messenger, now it is necessary to have a secretary, a clerk, a stenographer, a messenger, and two inspectors, thus increasing the force. I suppose by the time the next appropriation bill comes along these gentlemen will need twice as many employees.

Everybody knows how the demand for additional employees increases. It grows up in every part of the Government. I hope the Committee on Appropriations will be able to give some reason

why this force, which was sufficient to discharge the duties imposed upon the board a year ago, is not sufficient now.

Mr. ALLISON. The board has not been organized for a year. They could not tell, nor could the Committee on the District of Columbia tell, the extent of their requirements or the amount of clerical force they would need. I have no doubt, I will say to the Senator, from such examination as we were able to give to the subject, that they do need this force, and I do not think that it will be increased next year.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. You say that this force has not been on duty?

Mr. ALLISON. The secretary has been on duty, one clerk, and possibly a messenger.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. One man who is clerk and stenographer?

Mr. ALLISON. I am not certain about that.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Arkansas will permit me, this matter is not very fresh in my mind, but I had something to do with the inquiry. I am very fully satisfied from what I know of the operations of this board, which is in the hands of competent people, as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] has suggested, most of them serving absolutely without compensation—

Mr. ALLISON. All of the members of the board so serving.

Mr. GALLINGER. Yes; all of the members serving without compensation. I am very well satisfied that the consolidation of these charities has not only been a very beneficial thing, but an economical thing; that in the operations of this board, even if we do increase the service, as is contemplated by the Senate amendment, we will be spending very much less money than we were when the matter was carried on in a desultory way, we making appropriations for this charity, and that charity, and the other charity, without really knowing very much about them. As the Senator from Iowa says, probably the money was expended judiciously; very likely it was; but we have made a consolidation of these charities, and have put them in the hands of benevolent people in the city—men and women who are willing to give their services gratuitously. We are now simply providing what is considered to be by those people adequate clerical and other assistance to carry on the operations of the board. I am sure they have not asked for anything that is extravagant, and I think the amendment of the committee ought to be adopted.

Mr. KENNEY. May I ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. KENNEY. Is it not a fact that these charities have now in contemplation a report to the Congress of the United States setting forth the necessities for the charities of the District in the most comprehensive way, and is it not the intention of that board to give information to Congress that will enable it to make appropriations more intelligently hereafter than ever before? On that line, is it not necessary that they should have the force that is proposed by the amendment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. GALLINGER. I understand that that is in contemplation.

I want to assure the Senator from Arkansas that this matter is in its incipient stage and that any appropriation that is made this year can not well be compared to any appropriation made to this board, for the reason that it has existed so short a time.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The statement made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] a while ago, that it has been the habit of Congress heretofore to make appropriations for this, that, and the other charity, practically without knowing anything about them, is just what I think the Senate ought not to do now. I think that we ought to know what we are making these appropriations for; what are the reasons for them; and we ought to be satisfied that they are proper. If it has been the habit of the Senate heretofore to make appropriations for these charities without understanding what they were about, it is time that we should make a change.

If a number of gentlemen have been selected to supervise these charities without compensation, I do not think it is wise or proper that we should provide a clerical force for these men, which will result in their turning their duties over to a lot of clerks, who will look out for these things and make reports for these gentlemen, and have the reports submitted to Congress without their personal investigation and their personal knowledge. I do not think anything will tend more to the debasement of the public service than to have a sufficient clerical force provided for men to discharge these duties, so that they will themselves turn their backs upon the duties and depend upon their clerks, and so that the management of this matter will go entirely into the hands of the clerks of those gentlemen who have volunteered to look after the disbursement of this money. If the clerical force provided for these gentlemen is sufficient now to perform these duties—and it appears the House of Representatives thought it was—unless there is some better reason given for the increase than that they are efficient

and that the system will be a good one, it seems to me the amendment ought not to be adopted.

I am not criticising the change which has been made in the system of supervising the District charities. I am inclined to think, from what has been said on the floor, that it was a wise thing to provide a board to look after the disbursement of the money appropriated for the local charities here; but I do not think, because that was wise, it will be necessarily wise for us to double the clerical force over what it has been heretofore and make it twice as large as the other House has recommended. I presume the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, who are the especial guardians of the purse of the country and are expected to look carefully to these expenditures, themselves knew the advantages that would come from the appointment of this board and they understood what force was necessary to carry on the work.

I can understand when this board had a secretary that he might need a clerk who was a stenographer, but I do not understand how the secretary of this board, who is himself the clerk of the board, should want another clerk. At the next session of Congress, I suppose, the clerk will need another clerk, and so on down ad infinitum.

I do not believe that this amendment ought to be made without some better reason for it than simply that this board is composed of benevolent gentlemen, men of good character, and that heretofore these appropriations have been made without the Senate knowing anything about them.

Mr. ALLISON. I only wish to occupy a moment. Heretofore the superintendent of charities received a salary of \$3,000 a year and he was authorized to have a messenger at \$840. Under the District appropriation bill of last year it was provided that the appropriations made before that time should be transferred to this new board. The president and the secretary of the board stated to us that a stenographer and a clerk were absolutely necessary and that the messenger and inspectors were necessary. They take control of children here, for example, in this District, and put them out with private families in Maryland and the adjoining country, where they are taught to work in various ways, but in a certain sense they must keep some supervision over these children for a length of time; and they convinced us that it was a most worthy and necessary project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Reformatories and correctional institutions," on page 50, line 2, to increase the number of "overseers for the Washington Asylum" from 9 to 11.

Mr. KENNEY. I desire to ask the Senator from Iowa, who has charge of the bill, the reasons for the increase of this force from 9 to 11. As I understand, prior to the passage of this bill by the House the number of overseers was 7. The number was increased by the House to 9, and now it is proposed to be increased by the Senate committee to 11.

Mr. President, I know that there are not in the employ of the Government of the United States a class of men whose compensation for the services they render the Government is so inadequate as the sum of \$600, which these overseers receive. The responsibility upon these men is very great. They have charge of the inmates of that asylum, and take them out upon the roads and streets for work. While they are accompanied by a member of the police force, yet all responsibility for the return of those prisoners is charged to these overseers.

When the number was 7, as was the case prior to the passage of this bill by the House, and as the case is now, those overseers in many cases—I think, one day out of every three—had to be on duty something like twenty-one or twenty-two hours.

It appears to me that it would have been wiser to have increased this number from 7 to 9, and given the 9 a proper compensation for the duty that they perform, rather than to have increased the number to 11. I should be very glad to hear what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has to say in regard to this increase in the number and the failure to increase the pay of these men to a proper sum.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, only a word. The estimates were for 11. We went over these items—the Senator will see there is a great number of them—as carefully as possible with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. They stated to us that 11 were essential to the proper discharge of the duties of these overseers; that the increased number was necessary in order to allow the overseers to have twelve hours each, instead of working sixteen hours, as some of them have been doing. It is desired that the number be increased from 7 to 11, thus allowing them twelve hours on and twelve hours off duty. We thought that the best thing we could do was to keep these people at a salary of \$600 at twelve hours a day.

Mr. KENNEY. I have no objection to the increase, Mr. President, but I think the increase of salary ought to follow the increase of the force.

Mr. ALLISON. Perhaps that may be so; but we did not go into the question of salary, as no claim for an increase was made.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 51, line 1, to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the Washington Asylum from "\$22,393" to "\$23,593."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 7, after the word "services," to insert "and not exceeding \$900 for purchase of kitchen utensils and diet for hospital;" so as to make the clause read:

For contingent expenses, including improvements and repairs, provisions, fuel, forage, lumber, gas, ice, shoes, clothing, dry goods, tailoring, hardware, medicines, repairs to tools, cars, tracks, steam heating and cooking apparatus, painting, and other necessary items and services, and not exceeding \$900 for purchase of kitchen utensils and diet for hospital, \$55,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read the following clause:

For continuing erection of a workhouse for males, \$50,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want to make an inquiry concerning this appropriation, which is a House appropriation, for the "erection of a workhouse for males, \$50,000." We have already appropriated \$100,000 for this purpose, and this is an additional appropriation of \$50,000, making \$150,000 for this item as continued in the bill.

There is a controversy in reference to the matter of continuing this workhouse in its present location. It is almost on the border of the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River, one of the most malarial situations that can possibly be imagined. I think I am not mistaken in saying that provision has been made—it is made in this very bill by virtue of a Senate amendment—for taking the almshouse from that locality and putting it in some other part of the District, which, I think, is a very desirable thing to have done.

I know that my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER]—and I wish that he were present—has given a great deal of attention to this matter, and is very strongly of opinion that it is bad public policy and an unwise expenditure of money to make a very large investment toward the construction of a new workhouse on the present site. As I understand the matter, there are plans now drawn that will involve an expenditure of between six and seven hundred thousand dollars for a building; and this is to be done in the face of the fact that there are very grave sanitary questions arising in connection with it, and very acute differences of opinion as to the propriety of concluding this work.

Inasmuch, Mr. President, as \$100,000 has heretofore been appropriated and no part of it expended—unless some portion of it was diverted or properly used for the plans that have been made—I feel like appealing to the committee to in some way stop this matter for the present, and to give us a little time to more maturely consider it. I do not know that the committee will at all agree with me in that view, but I am clearly of opinion, having visited this institution and having some professional knowledge of the question, that it is possible that we are making a grave mistake, and that it may be a wise thing for us to pause and give further and more careful consideration to the question.

Mr. COCKRELL. How would it do to put in an amendment for the completion of the building?

Mr. GALLINGER. I have on my desk an amendment, which I thought I might offer, touching this very matter, and, to be entirely frank, I will say that if the amendment is adopted it will doubtless stop this work for the present and enable us to consider it more carefully than I think we have done. I will send the amendment to the desk, and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 51, line 11, after the word "dollars," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That the total cost of the building shall not exceed \$150,000, including the \$100,000 heretofore appropriated; and said Commissioners are hereby authorized, in their discretion, to expend for temporary frame structures, to meet present institutional needs, not exceeding \$20,000 of the sum heretofore appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. ALLISON. I have here a letter from the Engineer Commissioner of the District, in which he explains this matter more in detail. I will not read it, but I will state the substance of what he says, which is that this workhouse will cost a hundred thousand dollars, or in that neighborhood, but that there are certain incidental and necessary expenses outside of the contract price which ought to be provided for. This letter, I will say, was written after the bill was reported to the Senate, and from this letter I infer that \$25,000 is sufficient to complete the workhouse, and

not the sum suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, according to my understanding of what is proposed.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me right here, I will state that I received my information from two gentlemen who, as I understand, are connected with the almshouse in an official capacity, and they distinctly stated to me that there was a plan already in existence, approved by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, which would involve an expenditure of \$650,000. That is all I know about it. I simply stated what was stated to me.

Mr. ALLISON. I understand that, but I speak now of the actual purpose and aims of the Commissioners. I agree to the amendment suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, and I would have proposed to have reduced the amount in line 10, page 51, to \$25,000; but inasmuch as he, I think wisely, suggested that \$20,000 of the hundred and fifty thousand may be used for temporary purposes—

Mr. GALLINGER. Which is needed very much.

Mr. ALLISON. Which I know is needed and which the Engineer Commissioner also suggests is needed, I agree to the amendment suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, and I ask that it may be read again so that I may hear it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator propose that action upon it shall now be had?

Mr. ALLISON. I will state that I had a similar amendment which I intended to offer, and therefore I will adopt this as a committee amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire has offered an amendment, which will be again stated.

Mr. ALLISON. I will adopt it as a committee amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report of the Engineer Commissioner be read.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I ask for the reading of the letter to which the Senator from Iowa referred. I should be very glad to have it all read.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Missouri, who made some special investigation of this matter, handed me an amendment which I intended to offer from the committee. I do not know that it is precisely the amendment suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, but it is practically the same.

Mr. GALLINGER. Under those circumstances I think I ought to withdraw the amendment I have offered, and permit the committee to submit their amendment. I did not know the committee had an amendment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the amendment will not be withdrawn until this matter can be looked into. I have some pretty strong convictions about it, and I propose to submit them to the Senate before the Senate disposes of the matter.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from New Hampshire has withdrawn his amendment, as he had a right to do, and I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Has he a right to withdraw it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 51, line 11, after the word "dollars," it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That the total cost of the building shall not exceed \$150,000, including the \$100,000 heretofore appropriated; and said Commissioners are hereby authorized, in their discretion, to expend for temporary frame structures to meet present institutional needs not exceeding \$20,000 of the sum heretofore appropriated for this purpose.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is substantially the same thing.

Mr. ALLISON. It is substantially the same amendment. The Senator from Arkansas wanted to have this letter read.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes, sir; I wish to hear the whole of the letter.

Mr. ALLISON. I will ask the Secretary to read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ENGINEER COMMISSIONER
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, February 4, 1901.

SENATOR: In reply to your oral inquiry of this afternoon, I would state that the balance available for constructing the workhouse for males, remaining from the two appropriations of \$50,000 each, is \$96,537.

The plans for the building have been prepared, the work advertised, and proposals received.

The specifications on which proposals were received were so worded that the building can be constructed under one contract, including cells and plumbing, or contract can be made for the building alone. The building complete will cost a little over \$100,000, and the bidders have expressed their willingness to await a new appropriation, which should be not less than \$20,000 or \$25,000, owing to architect's fees, incidental expenses, etc., to permit the erection of the building. If the appropriation of \$50,000, now carried by the bill, is retained, there will be no difficulty whatever about putting up the building. If there is any danger of the item being removed, contract can be entered into for the building itself, without cells or plumbing, for about \$87,000. The award of this contract can be made at once, if considered advisable.

Concerning the attempts of certain parties to have the workhouse removed from the eastern section, where it now exists, it might be stated that as the

jail is now in that vicinity it would seem much better policy to keep the two institutions in proximity to each other than to remove the workhouse to some different locality. Furthermore, if the workhouse were to be removed from its present site, it is believed that great difficulty would be found in locating it at any other point, as property owners adjoining any site chosen for it would in all probability consider it equally undesirable as do the parties who are now seeking to have it removed.

The present location, it is believed, is the most advantageous that could be secured, and as the ground already belongs to the Government no expense will be incurred for purchasing site, which at any other locality would amount to a large sum.

Very respectfully, yours,

LANSING H. BEACH,
Captain, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.,
Engineer-Commissioner, District of Columbia.

Hon. W. B. ALLISON,

Chairman Committee on Appropriations, Senate.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, some of the objections I have, have been better stated by the Senator from New Hampshire than I could have stated them, he being more familiar with the facts than I am. I have heard a good deal of complaint about the location of this building. While I know nothing of it personally, never having visited the spot, the information I have received heretofore is greatly strengthened by what the Senator from New Hampshire has already said about the malarious location and the undesirable situation of the building. Of course, whenever there is a complaint about the location of anything of this kind in the District, you must always bear in mind the selfish and personal interests that influence men to favor or oppose a movement of that kind, and I am not fully informed personally about what are the facts in this case. But I am strongly led to believe that there should be, in addition to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire, a provision for a further investigation as to the propriety of beginning the permanent improvements on this spot.

If it should turn out that this place is as unhealthful as it is said to be and is as undesirable as it is for many reasons, and the Government should expend a hundred or a hundred and fifty thousand dollars, and then the argument were brought up against other expenditures which ought to be made that it was an undesirable place, the proposition would be made to move it. If we intend to remove this institution from this spot, it is important that the removal should be made before this work begins. Now that a hundred thousand dollars is appropriated and we are proposing to increase this, it can be done without any material loss, and it seems to me it would be wise to have some competent body of men look into the matter and ascertain fully what ought to be done. So far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to follow the judgment of the Committee on the District of Columbia, if they have investigated the matter. I am fully persuaded that the personal investigations of the Senator from New Hampshire make a case, at least prima facie, in favor of removal, and that there should be some other locality selected for this purpose before the building is begun. I was in hopes that the committee would be willing to provide that this building should not be erected until after an investigation by the District Committee or by some other competent body of men, who should examine carefully the present location and any other location that might be thought desirable and determine the best point upon which the institution should be erected.

I have no doubt from the information I have received that there is already a plan prepared which will involve, as I understood, about \$700,000. The Senator from New Hampshire says he is told by a couple of men who are connected with this institution that it is to be \$650,000. I presume that is as near to the amount as a man not connected with it is likely to get. Under these circumstances it seems to me before we enter upon a plan to spend six or seven hundred thousand dollars in erecting great improvements that ought to be put somewhere, we should know and be sure that we have selected the proper place for the location of the building. It will be a waste of a hundred or a hundred and fifty thousand dollars if we ascertain afterwards that it is not a desirable place and that the removal ought to be made. Things of that kind do occur too often in the management of public affairs. No intelligent private citizen, thinking of entering upon a work of this kind, would entertain for a moment the idea of expending one dollar until he had first made up his mind fully and completely as to the locality where the improvement ought to be made. It seems to me that the Congress of the United States ought to act with the same sort of circumspection and care that a private individual would in the building of a private enterprise.

I hope the Committee on Appropriations will be willing to have some sort of a provision go in here directing that an investigation shall be made and that it shall be determined by some unprejudiced and impartial tribunal as to where this expenditure shall be made and providing that none of the money here proposed to be appropriated shall be expended until that question has been settled, and settled definitely.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, just one word. I have visited personally the almshouse and the jail and am familiar with the property surrounding it. The Government owns, I think, nearly

80 acres of land in the vicinity. The almshouse is more than fifty years old. I would not undertake to say just how many years ago it was established, but it has been there for many long years. The workhouse has been there. The two have been unfortunately near to each other. There is no need of an investigation. There is a contest about it. Of course the people who own property in the neighborhood of it would be glad to get rid of these institutions in order that the amount of land might be opened up to settlement for dwellings, etc.

But every Commissioner, so far as I know—and this is no new matter with the Committee on Appropriations; we appropriated \$50,000 for this purpose two years ago, and we appropriated last year \$50,000—testifies that this is the only available locality for a workhouse unless we go far out into the country. The jail is there, a substantial building surrounded by a high fence, and occupying a plot of some 20 acres. The workhouse should be in the neighborhood of it. It is a part of the same system. We have proposed and do propose in this bill that the almshouse shall be taken away from the workhouse, where there are now probably two or three hundred people, condemned by our police courts, and that the almshouse, which shelters poor worthy people of both sexes and both colors, shall have a separate place in which to care for them.

I hope the amendment which will be reached in a few moments will be agreed to, and that the amendment of which the Senator from New Hampshire approves will also be agreed to, and that this workhouse, which is absolutely essential, shall be completed at the earliest possible day.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire, who is certainly a gentleman of intelligence, believes that this is an undesirable place, I understand; that it is a malarious part of the District, and that the building ought not to be erected there. He has visited it and is familiar with it. So there must be some controversy not purely a matter of dollars and cents and not a matter of business on account of the people who have property in the neighborhood of it. If the Senator from Iowa is right, and if the property is as valuable and desirable as he seems to think it is, it seems to me it would be a wonderfully sensible thing to remove both of these institutions on to higher and more desirable ground and to go to the country with them. Why not? What is the necessity for having an almshouse or a workhouse immediately within the city of Washington? It seems to me it would be better to have them on the outside; it would be better to have them in the country; it would be better to have them away from the people who are living in the city of Washington.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to ask the Senator from Arkansas where the almshouse is located and where the workhouse is located?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I have never seen it in my life. I know there is complaint about these appropriations, and, as the Senator from Iowa has just now stated, it is no new question with the Committee on Appropriations. I have been hearing complaints about this location for years.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is east of the Capitol.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Somewhere on the Eastern Branch not far from the jail.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Where the old Congressional jail used to be?

Mr. ALLISON. Near the present jail, and on a part of the same ground where the jail is at this time and where it has been located for fifty years.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 51, line 17, after the word "dollars," to insert "to be immediately available;" so as to make the clause read:

For erection of bathrooms and closets for two buildings known as the "Old Men's Home," \$1,500, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, after line 17, to insert:

Municipal almshouse: For the purchase by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia of a suitable site in the District of Columbia for a municipal almshouse, \$25,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; for the preparation of plans for suitable buildings for such almshouse, \$2,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary; in all, \$27,500; and the total cost of such almshouse, exclusive of site, and including water supply, heating, ventilating, and lighting apparatus, and improvement of grounds, shall not exceed \$125,000.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to know something about this item. Is this the item for the purchase of the island in the Potomac?

Mr. ALLISON. It is not.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Medical charities," on page 55, line 9, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "five;" and in line 10, before the

word "thousand," to strike out "six" and insert "ten;" so as to make the clause read:

Garfield and Providence hospitals: For isolating wards for minor contagious diseases at Garfield and Providence hospitals, maintenance, each, \$5,000, \$10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 17 on page 55.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not know about the necessity for this clause. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa why these appropriations are made and the parties are required to make contracts with one particular hospital?

Mr. ALLISON. To what part of the bill does the Senator refer?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Page 55, line 14:

For the care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with the National Homeopathic Hospital Association by the board of charities, not to exceed \$8,500.

Why is it limited to contracts made with that one organization? It is a proposition requiring that contracts shall be made with the National Homeopathic Hospital Association.

Mr. ALLISON. It does not require it—

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It says:

For the care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with the National Homeopathic Hospital Association.

I do not understand it if it does not mean what I have said.

Mr. ALLISON. It is an appropriation for this hospital, under a contract to be made by the board of charities. The board of charities will have charge practically of all these medical patients, and they will make contracts with the hospital for their care out of these funds.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If any other hospital would make a contract to take care of these patients for a more reasonable sum of money than \$8,500, why not allow them to do it?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think that is the precise way in which we propose to deal with that question, or the precise way in which it ought to be dealt with.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should be glad to have the Senator explain it.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think that the treatment of patients should be put up at auction. A certain number of indigent people want to go, for example, to the Homeopathic Hospital, and the board of charities will make a contract with that hospital. It is an experiment. I do not know how it will work. The District of Columbia Committee have been pressing it for a good many years. We have hitherto appropriated direct to the hospital. Now it is proposed that the board of charities shall take charge of this appropriation and that they shall make contracts with the different hospitals for the care of indigent patients.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator from Iowa will permit me, the Senator from Arkansas will observe that the same page, lines 1 to 5, inclusive, has a similar provision concerning the Columbia Hospital, and lines 11 to 13, inclusive, contain a similar provision regarding the Children's Hospital.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Yes.

Mr. GALLINGER. The only changemade is not in the aggregate of the appropriation, but in the fact that the disbursement of the money so far as the contract is concerned is placed in the hands of the board of charities. That is all. Heretofore we have made a direct appropriation to the hospital.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. My criticism of this is that it seems that you direct the board of charities to make these contracts with the different hospitals, whether they think it wise to do it or not. If you have a board of charities composed of such intelligent and upright gentlemen as I understand they are, it seems to me they ought to make contracts with those hospitals which would be most favorable, and which would discharge the duties in the most efficient and humane way. They ought not to be compelled to send a part of these people to a particular hospital without regard to the way they treat their patients or the services they render.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not understand that they are compelled to do that. It says:

For the care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with the National Homeopathic Hospital Association by the board of charities, not to exceed \$8,500.

That is the limit of the contract that they can make with this hospital, and it is the limit of the appropriation to the hospital.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. In addition to that a contract must be made with that hospital or the \$8,500 absolutely lapses into the Treasury. It can not be used for hospital purposes.

Mr. HALE. Is not this the fact: Instead of appropriating outright to these hospitals, as we do in other cases, we provide that the money which they shall have shall be put in a contract? If we did not put it this way we would give it direct to the hospital. That is all there is of it.

Mr. GALLINGER. It will be remembered, too, Mr. President, that in a different bill we have appropriated some seventeen or

eighteen thousand dollars each to the Garfield and Providence hospitals—

Mr. ALLISON. We do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Under contract made with the Surgeon-General of the Army.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true as to Providence Hospital, and has been for a long time.

Mr. GALLINGER. I think as to Garfield Hospital likewise, though perhaps not.

Mr. ALLISON. This restricts it to a contract.

Mr. ALLEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa whether a contract made under this clause is revocable? Suppose, for instance, the board of charities makes a contract with the hospital referred to in this paragraph, and the standard of service, after the contract is made, falls below what it ought to be; is it within the power of the board of charities to revoke the contract?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know precisely how these contracts are to be made, but I think the board of charities will go to the managers or management of the Homeopathic Hospital, for illustration, and say "we will have from time to time indigent sick. What will you take care of them for, by the month, by the day, or the year, or other terms?" If they can come to an agreement, such indigent people as are sent to the hospital will be cared for on that basis.

Mr. KENNEY. Provided—

Mr. ALLISON. And, I take it also, provided that they are well cared for.

Mr. KENNEY. And that it does not exceed the amount appropriated.

Mr. ALLISON. And that it does not exceed the amount appropriated.

Mr. ALLEN. I beg leave to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the trouble with the bill is that it leaves that whole thing in the air.

Mr. ALLISON. Very likely. We have to leave a good many things in the air, Mr. President. We have a good many there now. You can not in an appropriation bill tie down these appropriations. You must leave their working out to a board that we have selected for that purpose. We assume, at least in the beginning, that they are acting wisely and honestly. Later they may act differently, but we expect them to fairly administer this appropriation.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I desire to thank the Senator for both his criticism and sarcasm. But that does not satisfy the question. You can not whistle it down the wind in that way. You are legislating here. You make provision for the care of certain classes of sick in these different hospitals, which, I think, is a wise provision, making specific reference to the different hospitals, making an appropriation for the maintenance of certain indigent persons at these hospitals. I approve of that. I have no fault to find with it. I do not think the appropriation is any too large at all.

But that does not answer the question. You make a contract for a specific time for a specific sum per capita, for instance, and where is the power under this bill or under any law to revoke that contract in the event that it is not carried out in good faith?

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I can conceive of one or two ways of partially revoking it, and that is when these patients are not well cared for to cease sending them there. That would be one way, but we have hitherto appropriated without limitation. This Homeopathic Hospital has had \$8,500 appropriated to it for a great many years to spend as it pleased, with practically no control. We are relying on the judgment, discretion, and skill of the people who are managing the hospital.

But now there appears a new method of dealing with these hospitals, through a board of associated charities, which board is required to supervise all these charities and see to it that the money we appropriate from year to year, drawn from the people and drawn by appropriation from the Treasury, shall be expended wisely and well. Therefore it is that this method of appropriation has been adopted. It is experimental. I hope it will prove to be a wise way of expending the money, and I think it will be.

Mr. ALLEN. What is the power of this board of charities?

Mr. ALLISON. There is a statute. They have absolute power of supervision and inspection over these charities.

Mr. ALLEN. Have they any power to remove a patient; for instance, after he has been put in one of these hospitals according to contract?

Mr. ALLISON. I should think so, because they could remove him.

Mr. KENNEY. I wish to ask the Senator a question. The method provided for by the bill differs from that which has heretofore been adopted by Congress in this, that heretofore there have been appropriations made direct to the hospital. Now it goes through and under the supervision of the board of charities. Is not that true?

Mr. ALLISON. That is true. That is the object.

Mr. ALLEN. There is a very radical fault with this bill. There is a lot of money appropriated indiscriminately without any restriction, placed in the hands of what is called a board of charities, without the slightest restraint upon them. They can at their caprice, at their own sweet will, make such a contract as they may see fit and the Government has to pay the amount of that contract from these appropriations.

Now, what is the authority of this board of charities, and when, if ever, have they power to remove a patient from one of these hospitals if in their judgment he is not being properly cared for or if the contract is not being lived up to? I take it, of course, that the Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, knows all about the appropriations and about the laws that we are appropriating money to fulfill.

Mr. ALLISON. The law was passed only on the day we adjourned at the last session. I will state the general duties of this board. The board of charities is required to

Visit, inspect, and maintain a general supervision over all institutions, societies, or associations of a charitable, eleemosynary, correctional, or reformatory character which are supported in whole or in part by appropriations of Congress, made for the care or treatment of residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. ALLEN. To visit, inspect, and supervise, but to what extent and in what respect?

Mr. ALLISON. To maintain a general supervision.

And no payment shall be made to any such charitable, eleemosynary, correctional, or reformatory institution for any resident of the District of Columbia who is not received and maintained therein pursuant to the rules established by such board of charities, except in the case of persons committed by the courts, etc.

They can investigate public institutions, etc. These are their general powers.

Mr. ALLEN. The reading of that law shows its absolute infirmity. There is no power whatever under the statute read by the Senator from Iowa to cancel this contract when once made. I submit no court will hold that you can annul or set aside a contract in the absence of specific provisions reserved in the contract itself or in the statute under which it is executed. The power must be reserved somewhere. It must be reserved either in the contract or in the statute.

Now, there is no reservation whatever in that statute. There is no power even to create a reservation, if this board of charities should enter into a contract, and there is no power conferred in this bill, if it shall become a law, authorizing them to annul or to set aside or to modify the contract in the slightest degree.

I want to profess my utmost confidence in the integrity of the board of charities and in the humane features of these different hospitals, but, Mr. President, while we recognize these things we must remember that it is a part of legislation to make it impossible to violate in either letter or spirit a statute. We turn the whole thing over to an organization called the board of charities, without any power on their part to supervise or to carry out in an effectual way a contract that may be entered into. And when this contract is once made under the provisions of this bill, if it shall become a law, it is an irrevocable contract so far as any authority on the part of the board of charities to revoke it is concerned.

Now, I submit that that is not good legislation. I do not want to criticize my distinguished friend who has spent forty years of his life in the public service, and who spent many years before he came here as a lawyer—and I may say, parenthetically, a very eminent lawyer, too. I do not want to be put in an attitude of criticizing him unnecessarily or of criticizing this bill, but the very element of a contract is the power to compel an execution of its provisions. Here is a lack of power to go to court. There can be no appeal to court. Here is a mere administrative power without judicial power, and practically without any effectual administrative power. This sum of money is turned over to them to make a contract with these different hospitals, which when made they have no power whatever to supervise, and no power to remove patients from them, if they are not properly treated and properly cared for.

The bill is full of defects of this kind. If this were simply an isolated instance it might be well enough to pass it over in silence, but every appropriation bill that has been passed in this Congress and in the Congresses preceding this that I have had the honor to attend and be a member of have been full of provisions conveying indiscriminate power to different administrative organs and bodies without the slightest provision in one of them ever calling upon those bodies upon whom this shadowy authority is conferred to account for the duties imposed upon them. Yet I suppose precedent is so strong that it becomes almost a matter of treason to protest against this loose system of legislation. The habit has become so strong upon Congress to appropriate large sums of money for different purposes without requiring anybody to account for the money sent to them or given to them, without any real power in the body upon whom the authority is conferred to effectually supervise and execute the provisions of the law,

that it is regarded now, Mr. President, as a settled precedent that it is to be followed hereafter; that any man who raises his voice against it or who protests that this great Government in its two branches of Congress should come down to the passage of laws that are effectual in themselves and that are businesslike in their character is to be regarded as eccentric and out of order.

Many of these appropriations are very valuable, many of them are very necessary, and I fully approve of this paragraph so far as the appropriation is concerned. I do not complain of the amount. It may not be sufficient; possibly it ought to be more; but I should like to see the paragraph so amended that there would be some safeguard in the expenditure of this sum of money; and I should like to see every one of these paragraphs appropriating the public moneys of the United States, that are wrung from the taxpayers of the United States under a system of onerous taxation, embrace some safeguard for the effectual carrying out of the appropriation and the provisions of the law.

No account is to be made of this money. Suppose a contract is made under this paragraph by which this sum of money is not all to be paid out, where does the surplus go? What becomes of the residue? No provision is made for its use in any other respect. It is simply a system of indiscriminate, disjointed, inconsistent appropriation of public money, turning it over to the hands of irresponsible parties who are not required to account for it.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I regret that the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill is absent. It seems to me that there is something material in this matter that I should like to have considered by the committee. The Senator from Maine stated that one of the objections to the old method of appropriating directly to these institutions was that there was practically no accountability, or that the appropriations made direct were not desirable, or that it had not worked well, and that was one of the reasons for the organization of this board for the disbursements. I am inclined to think that the establishment of the board was wise and correct; but the point to which I should like to direct the attention of the chairman of the committee, as I know it is useless to argue with the Senate about it unless I can satisfy the chairman of the committee himself that there should be some change, is that it seems to me this is just as absolute and direct an appropriation to these different institutions as was made before. Now I will read the paragraph—

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator from Arkansas allow me just a moment to explain the provision?

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. Heretofore we have appropriated for each one of these institutions a given sum of money. Some of them have had a certain number of patients, which would reduce the cost much lower than others. Others would have fewer patients. This would make the per capita cost of the number of patients vary very greatly.

The House has claimed for some time in the different appropriation bills that this service should be let by contract, so that each one of these institutions that was getting the charity should agree to take a given number of patients at a certain cost. The Senate has heretofore decided otherwise. In this change to the board of charities commission it was aimed to get rid of this whole thing and place it in their hands and let them have the supervision of it.

The House put in the clause about the contracts. It was not in the law before. They insist that more and better service will be had by that system than by the appropriation of a gross sum. It is experimental. Some of us have serious doubt as to whether it is the best way or not, but the House has insisted on it, and we concluded to give it a trial for one time at least.

Mr. HAWLEY. I should like to inquire whether these institutions have submitted their accounts to a board of auditors? I hear nothing said about that. I understand that the money is just passed over to them and left to their own discretion without any inspection.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is what I understand, and that this is intended to remedy it. Now, while I think this provision as it stands is an improvement on what we have had, still there is, I think, a difficulty in it, and I should like to call the attention of the committee to it.

Mr. HAWLEY. I have always been accustomed to seeing institutions of that sort, or any body of men through whose hands money has to be spent, subjected to an audit.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It is proper that that should be the case, and it ought to be the case. Between this board as organized and the institutions there should always be some accounting. I will state the difficulty that I see about it. I ask the attention of the Senate to the reading of this paragraph:

For the care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with the National Homeopathic Hospital Association by the board of charities, not to exceed \$8,500.

The point I make is that this \$8,500 must be spent with that institution or it is not available.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] stated just now that the House has always contended that these charities should be taken care of by contract. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] said that there was no disposition to let these things out to the lowest bidder. I think it is a proper thing to do to have contracts made about these things, but I do think there should be some discretion in this board, if it is worth anything, to make arrangements where they are most favorable and where they are carried out in the best way. If the board declines to make a contract with the Homeopathic Association, for instance, that \$8,500 must lapse into the Treasury. If some other institution proposes to do that needed work at a reasonable price and in a satisfactory way, it can not be done under the operation of the law as proposed in the bill.

I do believe that there should be some discretion left in the board having charge of this work, and that these institutions ought to understand that unless they render the service satisfactorily to the board they will not be continued in the exercise of this right, and this ought not to be a positive appropriation of \$8,500 to this institution without any regard to the service they render. I understand, of course, that if the service they render is not satisfactory the board may decline to put any of these indigent people in this hospital at all; but the difficulty, as I see it, and one that I think ought to be remedied, is that if this Homeopathic Association fails to render the service necessary for this amount and there is some other institution wishing and willing to render the proper service for a fair consideration, the money should be used with them to have the necessary work done.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. KENNEY. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. KENNEY. For the information of the Senate, and particularly for the information of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN], I desire to call the attention of the Senate and of the distinguished Senator to the provision of law establishing the board of charities. Without reading the entire act, I will call his attention particularly to this part of it:

The said board of charities shall visit, inspect, and maintain a general supervision over all institutions, societies, or associations of a charitable, eleemosynary, correctional, or reformatory character which are supported in whole or in part by appropriations of Congress, made for the care or treatment of residents of the District of Columbia; and no payment shall be made to any such charitable, eleemosynary, correctional, or reformatory institution for any resident of the District of Columbia who is not received and maintained therein pursuant to the rules established by such board of charities, except in the case of persons committed by the courts, or abandoned infants needing immediate care.

It seems to me that the establishment of this board by law under the act which I hold in my hand, and which I shall ask may be printed entire in the RECORD, would remove the objections made by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. They have a supervisory control over all institutions with which contracts are made for the care of patients or in which the indigent residents of the District of Columbia are placed. It seems to me that that board, made up, as it is, of such distinguished citizens of the District of Columbia, would be a guaranty that no appropriation placed in their hands would be otherwise than properly expended.

The act to establish a board of charities for the District of Columbia is as follows:

An act to establish a board of charities for the District of Columbia.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be established in the District of Columbia a board of charities, to consist of five members, residents of the said District, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, each for a term of three years, but in such manner that the terms of not more than two of them shall expire in any one or the same year. The members of the said board shall serve without compensation. During his term of office no member shall serve as trustee or other administrative officer of any institution subject to the visitation of the said board. The board shall elect a president and vice-president from among its own members, and shall appoint a secretary, who shall receive a salary of \$3,000 per annum; and a messenger, who shall receive a salary of \$840 per annum; and may appoint such other officers, inspectors, and clerks as it may deem proper, and fix the number, duties, and compensation of such other officers, inspectors, and clerks, subject to appropriations of Congress: *Provided*, That the office of superintendent of charities of the District of Columbia is hereby abolished from and after the 30th day of June, 1900; and the amounts appropriated in the act making appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, for salaries of superintendent of charities and of messenger in the office of said superintendent and for traveling expenses are hereby made available for the payment of secretary of the board of charities, messenger for said board, and necessary traveling expenses authorized by said board.

The said board of charities shall visit, inspect, and maintain a general supervision over all institutions, societies, or associations of a charitable, eleemosynary, correctional, or reformatory character which are supported in whole or in part by appropriations of Congress, made for the care or treatment of residents of the District of Columbia; and no payments shall be made to any such charitable, eleemosynary, correctional, or reformatory institution for any resident of the District of Columbia who is not received and maintained therein pursuant to the rules established by such board of charities, except in the case of persons committed by the courts, or abandoned infants needing immediate care. The said board of charities shall be provided with suitable rooms in the building occupied by other departments of the government of the District of Columbia. Regular meetings of the said board shall be held at least once each month, and more often if required. The said board shall make such rules and orders for the regulation of its proceedings

as may be deemed necessary. The officers in charge of all institutions subject to the supervision of the board of charities shall furnish said board, on request, such information and statistics as may be desired; and to secure accuracy, uniformity, and completeness of such statistics the board may prescribe such forms of report and registration as may be deemed to be essential; and all plans for new institutions shall, before the adoption of the same, be submitted to said board for suggestion and criticism.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia may at any time order an investigation by the board, or a committee of its members, of the management of any penal, charitable, or reformatory institution in the District of Columbia; and said board, or any authorized committee of its members, when making such investigation, shall have power to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and affirmations; and the report of such investigation, with the testimony, shall be made to the Commissioners. All accounts and expenditures of said board shall be certified as may be required by the Commissioners and paid as other accounts against the District of Columbia. The said board shall make an annual report to Congress, through the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, giving a full and complete account of all matters placed under the supervision of the board, all expenses in detail, and all officers and agents employed, with a report of the secretary, showing the actual condition of all institutions and agencies under the supervision of the board, the character and economy of administration thereof, and the amount and sources of their public and private income. The said report shall also include recommendations for the economical and efficient administration of the charities and reformatories of the District of Columbia. The said board shall prepare and include with its annual report such estimates of future appropriations as will, in the judgment of a majority of its members, best promote the effective, harmonious, and economical management of the affairs under its supervision; and such estimates submitted shall be included in the regular annual Book of Estimates. No member or employee of said board shall be either directly or indirectly interested in any contract for building, repairing, or furnishing any institution which by this act the board is authorized to investigate and supervise. All acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Approved, June 6, 1900.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I dislike to take a single additional moment of the time of the Senate in discussing this matter, as I am very anxious that this appropriation bill shall be disposed of so that I can ask consideration for the pension appropriation bill, notice of which I gave more than a week ago.

Mr. ALDRICH. What was the suggestion made by the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. GALLINGER. Merely that I wanted to have the pension appropriation bill passed as soon as possible.

Mr. ALDRICH. I desire to take up the revenue bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. We will adjust that when we get to it.

I wish only to add that I have been in public life a comparatively brief time, but during the twelve years I have been here I have taken an interest in the charitable institutions of Washington, and I have yet to hear a single complaint from a citizen of the District of Columbia as to the hospitals of this city. Not one single complaint, that I am aware of, has been made orally or in print concerning the management of these institutions.

It should be borne in mind, Mr. President, that every well-organized hospital has a board of trustees who scan the appropriations, and who hold those who are disbursing them to a very strict accountability.

The provision in this bill gives us an added guaranty that the money will be judiciously and properly expended. In addition to the board of trustees, it puts it in the hands of this board of charities, who will make a contract with these hospitals for the care of a certain number of patients per week at a stipulated price. There is no possibility of peculation; there is no possibility of misappropriation of funds; and so far as the supervision is concerned it gives better supervision than we have ever had in the years past, when no complaints have been uttered as to their management.

I feel very sure, Mr. President, that there can be no well-grounded opposition to the provisions of the bill so far as the hospitals of the District are concerned.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I wish to reply very briefly to the remarks of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY] with regard to the act of Congress to which he made reference. The language of the act of Congress of June 6, 1900, so far as it is applicable to this question, is as follows:

That the office of superintendent of charities of the District of Columbia is hereby abolished from and after the 30th day of June, 1900; and the amounts appropriated in the act making appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, for salaries of superintendent of charities and of messenger in the office of said superintendent and for traveling expenses are hereby made available for the payment of secretary of the board of charities, messenger for said board, and necessary traveling expenses authorized by said board.

This is the particular part to which I desire to refer:

The said board of charities shall visit, inspect, and maintain a general supervision over all institutions, societies, or associations of a charitable, eleemosynary, correctional, or reformatory character which are supported in whole or in part by appropriations of Congress, etc.

The language of the bill which we are now considering is as follows:

For the care and treatment of indigent patients, under a contract to be made with the National Homeopathic Hospital Association by the board of charities, not to exceed \$3,500.

It is not a question whether the members of the board of charities will execute in good faith, as I have no doubt they will, the

provisions of the law. This is a question of power, of statutory power, and that power is confined to the language I have just read.

The said board of charities shall visit, inspect, and maintain a general supervision over all institutions, societies, etc.

They shall visit, inspect, and maintain supervision.

Mr. President, there is no authority in visiting an institution; there is no authority in inspecting an institution; there is no authority in supervising an institution.

Mr. ALLISON. Is not the word "maintain" there?

Mr. ALLEN. "And maintain a general supervision." There is no authority even there. What is the general supervision of an institution in the absence of a statute pointing out specifically the powers of the superintendent? It can not be said that the act to which I have referred and the bill which is before the Senate, if it shall become a law, will be statutes in pari materia, and, therefore, will be construed together. The specific provision of the bill now before the Senate, if it shall become a law, modifies and repeals any provision in the act of Congress to which I have made reference in so far as there may be a conflict.

No man ever heard of a board administrative in its character, a board not clothed with judicial power or jurisdiction, but having purely statutory power, having any specific power with reference to an institution under the general language that it might have general supervision of that institution or of a specific institution. Either it has plenary power under that provision or it has none whatever, except a mere advisory power; and of that, of course, I complain.

As the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] well said a moment ago, they are not required to make any account to anybody. There is no auditor appointed to go over the accounts as to the expenditure of this money; but the whole thing is left to the discretion and the caprice of this board of charities.

It was said by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY], and I do not doubt it, that the members of this board are eminent and wise gentlemen. That is true of millions of people. There are millions of eminent gentlemen and wise gentlemen in this country and, I presume, in other countries; but we do not make statutes simply that they may be carried out by eminent men and wise men. Sometimes we have boards, however honest they may be, that are not wise; that are not discreet in the execution of law. Law is made to throw a safeguard around the public and around the subject of the particular legislation, so as to make it impossible for anything wrong to be done under the provisions of the law, or in violation of the law, without some degree of accountability.

Mr. President, there is not a county in the United States where they have a county treasurer, there is not a municipal government, there is not a State treasurer in the United States who is not required to give security for the faithful discharge of his duties and for the money that comes into his hands. It might as well be said that all these gentlemen are eminent gentlemen and wise gentlemen and honest gentlemen, and therefore it is not necessary to require any security in the form of bonds from them; but the experience of the American people has been that, however eminent and wise a man may be, there is but one safeguard when public funds are to be expended, and that is to require provisions of law pointing out the duties of the custodian of those funds and requiring him to give security for the faithful execution of that law.

Here is a proposed law in this bill as barren of every safeguard as the Sahara Desert is of oases; and I regret to say when my distinguished and honorable friend, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is appealed to in all sincerity and good faith to take a pencil and write into that bill some safeguard he seems to think it entirely unnecessary.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Child-caring Institutions," on page 56, line 6, after the word "dollars," to insert "and one superintendent and disbursing officer, at \$1,500;" and in line 10, before the word "dollars," to strike out "seven thousand" and insert "eight thousand two hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

Board of Children's Guardians: For the Board of Children's Guardians, created under the act approved July 26, 1892, namely: For administrative expenses, including salaries of agents, not to exceed \$2,400, and one superintendent and disbursing officer, at \$1,500, expenses in placing and visiting children, and all office and sundry expenses, \$3,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, after line 21, to insert:

For burial of children who die while wards of the board, \$300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 24, to increase the total appropriation "for the maintenance of the Board of Children's Guardians" from "\$47,000" to "\$48,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of the clause on line 25, on page 58, making appropriations for the "Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb."

Mr. McCOMAS. Mr. President, I do not desire to take any time, but I just happened to hear the Secretary reading the appropriation for the deaf and dumb of the District of Columbia. This is perhaps the hundredth annual appropriation for the District of Columbia. The session is nearing its close. Congress has recently celebrated the anniversary of the removal of the seat of government to the District of Columbia and yesterday celebrated the coming of Chief Justice Marshall to the head of the Supreme Court; and yet the District of Columbia for one hundred years has not been able to have a codification of its laws.

I ask the attention of the Senate now only for a moment, that it shall not be deaf and dumb to the rights of a population of a quarter of a million, who should have, as every civilized state should have, a codified system of laws. A bill passed the House of Representatives last summer to give this District such a code. The Committee on the District of Columbia of this body have been most careful and most earnest in examining that code. We have endeavored in every way to get a night session of the Senate in order to secure the passage of that code.

I want to say to the Senate—and I will take no time about it—that the code was first a labor of duty and of love. It was prepared by a very eminent and able judge, Justice Cox, who spent several years upon it; and later the Bar Association, which is here a body of high repute and influence and respectability, took it in charge and spent a long time in having it again revised and rerevised. It was carefully considered in the other House. It has now been passed upon favorably by the public bodies of the District—they have no suffrage here—but all of the bodies who have influence, and they ought to have weight with this Senate, have commended it.

Nobody has strenuously opposed it. We have been having these worthy and proper celebrations; and I hope that the Committee on the District of Columbia may be allowed later on to have that bill come up, and that it may be passed. If it fails, gentlemen tell me who have now spent on this work three or four years, from interest in the District of Columbia and its courts and its laws, not for the purpose of self or for any corporate influence whatever, but only from public motives, that if this matter fails now to pass the Senate, it being on its Calendar, in the remaining few weeks of the session, the effort to get a system of law and a code for this District may not be revived again for a quarter of a century. If they find the Senate deaf and dumb to the rights of this population of the capital city, and they remain a half century behind the world elsewhere and in all the States, it will be a travesty upon justice. The Senate is very busy, but it ought to take one or two nights later on to have that code read and passed; to which I am sure there ought to be no objection because of the unusual unselfishness of the men who have urged it and who have revised it.

I only want to make this code a matter of consideration, so that later on, when the committee again make an appeal, there will be found some time in the remaining days to give attention to this District code of laws.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," at the top of page 59, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That hereafter all deaf mutes of teachable age, of good mental capacity, and properly belonging to the District of Columbia shall be received and instructed in said institution, their admission thereto being subject to the approval of the superintendent of public schools in the District of Columbia. And said institution shall not be regarded nor classified as an institution of charity.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. From the reading of the Secretary I did not quite understand the provision at the top of page 59, which reads as follows:

Provided, That hereafter all deaf mutes of teachable age, of good mental capacity, and properly belonging to the District of Columbia shall be received and instructed in said institution, their admission thereto being subject to the approval of the superintendent of public schools in the District of Columbia. And said institution shall not be regarded nor classified as an institution of charity.

I do not understand what the effect of that last declaration will be. Does it mean that there is to be compensation claimed for the education of these people and subsequent appropriations made?

Mr. COCKRELL. It makes no change in regard to the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, except that it takes it away from the board of charities, who claim that under the law it would come under their jurisdiction as a charitable instead of an educational institution.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. All right.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 59, line 21, after the word "*Oneida*," to insert "to be immediately available;" so as to make the clause read:

For rent, fuel, light, care, and repair of armories, and practice ships, and

for telephone service, including \$3,800 for refitting the *Oneida*, to be immediately available, \$18,275.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to have some explanation of the provision:

For rent, fuel, light, care, and repair of armories, and practice ships, and for telephone service, including \$3,800 for refitting the *Oneida*, etc.

I believe there is but one telephone company in the city.

Mr. VEST. There can not be but one.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is exactly the one point I wanted to raise. While we have passed a law here undertaking to regulate the charges made by telephone companies, while the action of Congress has been absolutely disregarded by the existing company, and after the House has passed a bill providing for the organization of a different company, so that there can be competition in the matter of telephone rates in this city, we are making appropriations for paying charges which are directly in the face of the law, as I understand it, and paying more than we ourselves have already said this company should have the right to charge.

This is a company exercising their rights under a franchise given them by Congress. They exist by permission of Congress, and yet, when we propose to limit the rates they are to charge, they absolutely defy Congress; they refuse to pay any attention to the law; they charge what they please, and Congress humbly submits to their exactions and pays whatever they demand. It seems to me that we ought not, at least, to submit to that.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I do not think the charges of the telephone company, so far as the Commissioners are concerned, are in any sense exorbitant. There is a close relation between the telephone company in this city and the police and the fire department of the District, etc. I do not know the details. I only know that the Commissioners are satisfied with the arrangements they have with the telephone company. They have wires in the telephone conduits and have wires on poles, and I do not think they pay unreasonable rates for the telephone service.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The Government does pay for the use of the telephone, and I presume the company demands that Congress shall absolutely disregard its own law and pay them higher rates for the use of the telephone than Congress has said they should be allowed to charge.

Mr. ALLISON. I think it does not. My belief—although I am not prepared to say positively—is that the rates charged to the Government of the United States are less than the rates indicated in the law upon the statute books.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then the effect of the action of Congress would be practically to say, so long as the telephone company does not fleece the Government, it is at liberty to fleece private citizens to its satisfaction.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Arkansas can very well construe this according to his own idea.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. That is my construction.

Mr. ALLISON. That is not my idea.

Mr. KENNEY. May I ask the Senator in charge of the bill how many telephones are in use by the District Commissioners?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know.

Mr. KENNEY. There can not be many. I ask the Senator how many armories there are in the District?

Mr. ALLISON. I think really but one.

Mr. KENNEY. Really but one. Then, at the outside, there would not be more than two telephones used by the militia of the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. The fact that there are only two or three does not, in my judgment, change the proposition in any degree any more than if there were a thousand telephones.

Mr. KENNEY. I have not been able to satisfy myself by any facts which have been presented to the District Committee on the subject of telephones that the charges made for telephones by the company installed in this District have been outrageous.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Their charges are certainly in violation of law and in direct disregard thereof.

Mr. KENNEY. The telephone company is conducting its business under a decision of a court of this District which holds that the act of Congress attempting to limit their charges would be in fact prohibitory.

Mr. GALLINGER. And that the act is unconstitutional in that regard.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then there certainly ought not to be an objection to having another company, so that we should have competition between the two companies, with the possibility of determining the question as to whether their charges are reasonable or not.

There has been a bill before the Senate for a long time which passed the House of Representatives months ago, but it has been impossible to get it considered here. I hope the Senate will take up that bill and dispose of it favorably at an early day.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Water department," on page 61, line 12, to increase the appropriation for the salary of the foreman for the distribution branch of the water department of the District, from \$1,200 to \$1,500; and in line 19 to increase the total appropriation for the maintenance of the distribution branch of the water department of the District from \$30,466 to \$30,766.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. After the word "timekeeper," at the end of line 13, on page 61, I move to strike out "\$900" and insert "\$1,000."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 61, after the word "timekeeper," at the end of line 13, it is proposed to strike out "nine hundred" and insert "one thousand;" so as to read:

Timekeeper, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. Now I move, in line 19, to change the total from \$30,766 to \$30,866; so as to correspond with the amendment just made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and concluded.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer an amendment to come in on page 20, line 23, after the word "collected."

In view of the decision of the presiding officer this morning respecting another amendment, I will now ask unanimous consent to offer this amendment; and I hope the Senators who participated in the discussion this morning will take note of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After the word "collected," at the end of line 23, on page 20, it is proposed to insert:

Provided, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized to issue, from time to time, under such reasonable regulation as they may prescribe, permits for the extension of existing telephone conduits within the fire limits of the District of Columbia; and also such permits as may be necessary to enable house connections to be made therewith; and said Commissioners are hereby authorized to require the removal of overhead telephone wires and poles within said fire limits whenever, in their discretion, it seems desirable to have the wires so removed and placed in the conduits hereby authorized. In every conduit constructed under the provisions of this paragraph such number of ducts—not less than one nor more than three—as may be prescribed by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be reserved, free of charge, for the use of the United States and the District of Columbia for telephone purposes, carrying low potential currents of electricity. Any telephone company or corporation which shall willfully neglect or refuse to remove such poles and wires as may be ordered removed by the said Commissioners, under the authority given in this paragraph, shall be liable to a penalty of not more than \$25 for each and every day during which such neglect or failure shall continue, which amount may be recovered by the District of Columbia in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, a word of explanation in regard to this amendment.

Under the existing law it is not practicable or possible for any telephone company to lay conduits within the fire limits outside of the city of Washington. The Commissioners say that it is desirable that conduits should be laid in certain portions of the District within the fire limits, and that the poles now used for telephone wires should be taken down. The object of the amendment is to accomplish this purpose. If Senators will take a look at Columbia road, for example, or at several streets on Columbia Heights—not on Fourteenth street, but on the adjacent streets—they will observe that telephone poles are in use there. The Commissioners desire, within the fire limits at least, that they should have an opportunity to have conduits substituted for poles. That is the sole object of the amendment.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to hear the amendment again read. I did not understand from the first reading the full force of it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be again stated.

The Secretary again read the amendment proposed by Mr. ALLISON.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I understand that leaves the matter in the discretion of the Commissioners of the District, and they can leave the wires now, where it is necessary that it shall be done, and only require that they shall be changed under conditions which require it. That is all right.

Mr. PETTIGREW. As I understand this provision, it extends the rights and privileges of the telephone company of the District and gives them an extension of their system. If that is the case, I am very much opposed to it until they comply with the law passed by Congress regulating the price they shall charge the people of the District for their service.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will allow me, it simply authorizes the telephone company to put wires underground where they are now overhead. In other words, provide conduits. I asked unanimous consent that this amendment might be offered, as under the ruling of the Chair this morning it is not in order.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I understand that this company is charging in the District more than twice what the service is worth. Congress, several years ago, reduced by one-half its charges by an amendment on the District appropriation bill, but the company has refused to comply with the provision of the law, and has taken the matter into court and is contesting it there on the pretense, without making a report or showing as to the value of its property, its receipts, and its expenditures, that if the act of Congress is enforced its revenues would not be sufficient to pay dividends upon its investment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator must be aware of the fact that this matter went to the courts, and the courts decided the law unconstitutional, on the ground that it was a practical confiscation of the property of this company. Of course, the complainants have the right of appeal (I do not know whether they have taken advantage of it or not), but the matter was adjudicated so far as the court was concerned.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes, Mr. President, the court decided it unconstitutional on the ground, without the company making to Congress any showing of their receipts and expenditures, that the income at the reduced prices would not be sufficient to pay a dividend upon the stock. I do not know anything about the court, and I do not care to criticize it, but I do know that the price which we fixed was very much more than the service was worth and very much greater than the price charged elsewhere, especially where the city itself owns the telephone lines.

There is no question in my mind but that an independent telephone line, owned by the city of Washington, can serve the city for 25 per cent of what the people are charged now, and at a profit. The experience of other cities justifies that conclusion. I am opposed to doing anything for the telephone company until they comply with the provisions of law and charge only the prices which we fixed. If they defy Congress, what right have they to come here for any further privileges or for any further extension of their system in any part of the city? I do not care to make the point of order, but I do desire to enter my protest against this provision and against giving to these people any sort of consideration whatever. I think, of course, the proper remedy is that the city itself should own its own telephone line.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question. There is, as he knows very well, a bill pending here authorizing a new telephone company to do business in the District of Columbia. If the bill should pass allowing that company to put in telephones in the District, it would be absolutely necessary for them to have the same right to string their wires and to connect the wires with houses that the old company has. It would be impossible for them to carry out their system completely unless they had that right. Now, under this amendment would the District Commissioners have the power to allow the new company the same rights that the old company has now in matters of that sort?

Mr. ALLISON. I regret to say that I have not investigated the bill to which the Senator refers.

Mr. McMILLAN. I will state that the bill gives them ample power to put in conduits and go wherever they want all over the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Will this amendment, if adopted, interfere in any way with the power of these people to exercise the same rights in case that bill shall become a law?

Mr. McMILLAN. No; I do not think it will.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to be sure it would not.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am sure it would not.

Mr. ALLISON. It certainly can be cured, if that bill is to be adopted, when it is under consideration. I understand that it has not yet passed the Senate.

Mr. McMILLAN. No; it is on the Calendar.

Mr. ALLISON. So if there is any difficulty about that it can easily be remedied.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is on the Calendar, without recommendation.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I am opposed to chartering another telephone company in this city. If the courts have decided that the reduction of the rates to \$50 and \$75, or something like that, for private and business uses, respectively, is confiscation of their property (by reason of overcapitalization, in my opinion), because the company will not earn a dividend on the capital already invested or supposed to be invested, then the chartering of another company simply means that the people of the District will be compelled to have two telephones in order to reach the whole District, or that immediately after granting a charter to a new company the companies will consolidate and raise the price. The new company will add its capital stock to that of the old and

then the price will have to be increased in order to prevent confiscation of the property of these corporations. One or the other of these things will occur—either they will consolidate or else the people of the District will have to employ two systems and pay two prices.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I desire to ask him if he has noticed that very recently the Erie Telephone Company, which was the only real competitor the Bell had, has surrendered and become a part of the Bell system?

Mr. PETTIGREW. No; I did not know that, but I know from experience and observation that there is no possible question but that if we charter a new company here they will consolidate and there will be an increase of the capitalization upon which the people of the District will have to pay interest. If we can not regulate, if the courts interfere to prevent regulation, the only remedy is to put in a new system, owned by the public, and then give the service to the people of the District at reasonable rates and drive out this corporation which refuses to obey the law and charges excessive sums for the service.

Mr. ALLISON. I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ALLISON. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, after the words "United States" in line 21, it is proposed to insert:

Provided further, That all moneys collected on account of deductions made from the pay of any officer or enlisted man of the National Guard of the District of Columbia, on account of Government property lost or destroyed by such individual, shall be repaid into the United States Treasury to the credit of the officer of the militia of the District of Columbia who is accountable to the United States Government for such property lost or destroyed: And provided further, That all moneys collected on account of deductions made from the pay of any officer or enlisted man of the National Guard of the District of Columbia for or on account of any violation of the regulations governing said National Guard, shall be held by the commanding general of the militia of the District of Columbia, who is authorized to expend such moneys so collected for general incidental expenses of the service, and for all moneys so collected and expended the commanding general shall make an accounting in like manner as for the appropriation disbursed for pay of troops.

Mr. ALLISON. That is legislation, but I ask unanimous consent that it may be put on the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senate to return to page 17, where I believe will be found the only committee amendment not yet disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. After line 8, on page 17, the Committee on Appropriations report an amendment, to insert the following:

For sewage disposal system pumping station, \$400,000. And the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized to enter into contract or contracts for the completed building and so much of the machinery as may be immediately needed, at a cost not to exceed \$750,000.

For low-area trunk sewer, \$120,000.

Any balances of former appropriations remaining after the execution of contracts for works of the sewage-disposal system may be applied by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia in the execution of other portions of said sewage-disposal system.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I hope the Senator from Iowa will explain to the Senate about this amendment. It seems to provide for a very large expenditure, and I know nothing about it. I should like to hear some explanation of it.

Mr. ALLISON. This is to provide for a pumping station which is to be a part of the general sewage-disposal system of the District of Columbia.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Where is it to be located?

Mr. ALLISON. It is to be located at the foot of New Jersey avenue. It is in exact accordance with the report made by the expert engineers who examined the subject and under whose plan the general system is now being conducted for the disposal of sewage. This is a very important amendment to the sewage system of the District, because the work when completed will enable a large part of the sewage to be disposed of at the foot of New Jersey avenue.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I suppose it is important from the amount of money it costs, but I have no conception what the work is intended to do. The foot of New Jersey avenue is on the Eastern Branch, I believe, is it not?

Mr. COCKRELL. On the Eastern Branch.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I can not understand what is the purpose of a pumping station there. The sewage would naturally enter into the Eastern Branch there, I suppose, without having any pump for that purpose. Is it the intention to pump the sewage into the Eastern Branch?

Mr. ALLISON. It is the intention to pump it into the Eastern Branch and then into the Potomac on the other side of the Eastern Branch. It is a very great work. It is a work particularly described in the reports of the expert engineers made in 1894, and I have here what is known as Plate 12, describing in a general way the pumping station. It is also particularly described on

page 99 of this report. I understand that no material change has been made in the plan as proposed by this report, made in 1894, which I have before me. I can have parts of it read, if it is desired. It is intended that all of the sewage of this city shall eventually reach the pumping station at the foot of New Jersey avenue, to be pumped into the river and by a siphon process carried across the river on the other side, and then emptied into the river some miles down.

Mr. CHANDLER. That is what it means?

Mr. ALLISON. That is what it means.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senate understand that it is not proposed to utilize the results of the sewage disposal for fertilizing purposes, as is done in so many of the cities? Is not that proposed?

Mr. ALLISON. Not under this plan, as I understand it.

Mr. McMILLAN. I think the Senator from Iowa is mistaken. I think the intention is to utilize the sewage on the other side of the river.

Mr. ALLISON. On the other side of the river, in Virginia. That is very likely.

Mr. McMILLAN. It is proposed to pump it underneath and land it on the other side and utilize it there.

Mr. CHANDLER. This is one of the most important things that we can conceive of, if the modern system of the disposal of sewage of great cities is to be adopted in Washington. Instead of having all the sewage matter run into the Potomac, to pollute its waters, I understand it is all to be gathered into this basin, sent across the Eastern Branch, where there are to be works for disposing of the sewage and making it into fertilizing material, which is very valuable. So you not only keep the waters of the Potomac pure, but you get a valuable result.

I remember seeing in Connecticut, near the home of the Senator from Connecticut, I think perhaps near Meriden, a system of this kind, and I have seen and read of other works. They are adopted upon the wise principle of wasting nothing. The results of sewerage of Washington should be made very valuable by this plan, and the health of the city and of the whole country round about should thereby be promoted.

I know nothing of the details of the proposition, but I do know that if the preparation has been carefully made for this work, it behooves Congress to provide for this sewage-disposal system for the capital city of the nation.

Mr. ALLISON. This expenditure will in no way affect that question. Whatever is done with the sewage, this expenditure is absolutely essential. This is a part of the disposal of the sewage in the city which must be provided for.

Mr. CARTER. I call the attention of the Senator from Iowa, with his permission, to the statement made by the Engineer Commissioner in that behalf, that the amounts heretofore expended in connection with this great sewerage system practically are without any present avail until the pumping station shall have been constructed. The large sewer in front of the Capitol, which, it will be remembered, has been in course of construction for a considerable length of time—a very expensive piece of work—is at present only available for local deposits.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true.

Mr. CARTER. It can not be connected with the general system.

Mr. ALLISON. That is also true of the James Canal. The overflow water or the sewage there or whatever it may be can not be disposed of until this pumping station is provided.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. On page 18, after line 10, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, and agreed to, as follows:

For paving Crescent street west of Sixteenth street, \$3,000.

For paving Huntington street, \$5,000.

Mr. McMILLAN. On page 19, after line 19, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read and agreed to, as follows:

For grading and paving Connecticut avenue extended, between Le Roy place and Kalorama avenue, \$25,000.

Mr. McMILLAN. On page 26, line 16, before the word "filtration," I move to insert "slow sand."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. On page 55, after line 10, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read and agreed to, as follows:

For pointing up and painting all the interior walls and ceilings of the isolating wards for minor contagious diseases at the Garfield Hospital, \$1,750.

For completing the retaining wall on Sherman avenue by extending it from its present northern terminus in front of the isolating wards for minor contagious diseases at the Garfield Hospital to the northern boundary of the hospital grounds, \$1,400.

Mr. McMILLAN. On page 55, after line 10, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

Mr. ALLISON. These are amendments which, I understand, have the approval of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McMILLAN. I am instructed by the Committee on the District of Columbia to offer the amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. On page 55, after line 10, it is proposed to insert:

For the erection and equipment of a power house and nurse's home to be erected at Providence Hospital, \$50,000, to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. On page 58, after line 6, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The amendment was read and agreed to, as follows:

That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby authorized and directed to pay to the Columbia Polytechnic Institute for the Blind, a duly incorporated organization of the District of Columbia, the sum of \$5,000 made available by act of Congress approved June 6, 1900, for the instruction and employment of the blind who are actual residents of the District of Columbia, and for the purchase and repair of machinery and tools which may be needed to equip a workshop for the blind of said District: *Provided*, That such part of said appropriation as may be necessary may be used to reimburse any officer of said Columbia Polytechnic Institute for the Blind for any money he may have used of his own private funds for the equipping and maintenance of said workshop.

Mr. McMILLAN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 16, after the amendments inserted after line 10, it is proposed to insert:

The name of that portion of Fourth street NW., formerly a part of Four-and-a-half street, extending from D street to Pennsylvania avenue is hereby changed to John Marshall place, and from Pennsylvania avenue south the name of said street shall be Fourth street SW.

Mr. McMILLAN. I offer the amendment on behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], who has been trying to get the name of the street changed for many years. He made a personal request to me to offer it. As a member of the committee, I see no objection to it. It changes the name of the street to John Marshall place. It is a matter personal to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ALLISON. I shall not make a point of order on the amendment, but I do not know whether any embarrassment will result from its adoption.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SCOTT. On page 18, after the word "dollars," in line 22, I move to insert what I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 18, line 22, after the word "dollars," it is proposed to insert:

For paving Fourth street east from U street north to W street north, \$8,000.

Mr. ALLISON. I desire to ask the Senator from West Virginia if that is one of the streets estimated for in the Book of Estimates? Mr. SCOTT. I can not answer the question. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] tells me he thinks it was estimated for. The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to be inserted after line 21 on page 19.

The amendment was read, and agreed to, as follows:

For grading, regulating, and macadamizing Trenton street from Brightwood avenue to Eighth street, \$3,000.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The SECRETARY. On page 24, after the last line, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the electric and gas light companies shall hereafter file with the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on the 1st day of August of each year a statement showing the gross receipts of said corporation, an itemized statement of their receipts and expenditures, including the salaries paid to officials, the amount of bonded and other indebtedness, the amount of capital stock, and the amount of cash actually paid into the treasury of the company for the same.

Mr. ALLISON. Where does the Senator propose to offer that amendment?

Mr. PETTIGREW. At the bottom of page 24; so as to read: "Provided further," etc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It comes in after the word "Washington," in line 20, on page 24, that amendment having been rejected on a point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. On page 17, at the end of line 8, I move to insert:

For constructing main sewer from Third and Cincinnati streets NE., through the grounds of W. W. Davidge and the Trinity College, Michigan avenue, \$25,000.

I will say to the chairman that this item may be taken care of out of some other portion of the fund. If such should be found to be the case, it can be eliminated in conference.

Mr. ALLISON. It may be, although I think it is not. I am

willing that the amendment shall go in subject to the further recommendation of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and to investigation.

Mr. CARTER. Certainly; it is understood that the Commissioners will have to recommend it later.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. At the end of line 16 on page 43, after the word "dollars," I move to insert:

And the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are empowered to use any portion of this fund in placing said wires in ducts of the Washington Telephone Company, and a charter is hereby granted to the persons named as incorporators of said company, their associates and successors, on the terms and in the manner set forth in bill H. R. 9047 as it passed the House of Representatives March 19, 1900.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I make the point of order on that amendment that it proposes to charter a new telephone company in the District of Columbia, and it must be general legislation.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, it proposes to direct how a part of this appropriation shall be used. If adopted, it would be a part of the paragraph appropriating \$8,000 for the purpose of laying certain telephone wires, and it provides the means by which it is to be done.

Mr. GALLINGER. It provides that it shall be appropriated so as to enable the Washington Telephone Company to exist, a company that does not exist to-day. There is no such company.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It will exist after the amendment is adopted.

Mr. GALLINGER. Exactly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair sustains the point of order. If there are no further amendments as in Committee of the Whole, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Shall the question on concurring in the amendments in the Senate be taken on the amendments in gross? If there be no objection, it will be so ordered. Will the Senate concur in the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole?

The amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

H. S. REED, ALIAS DANIEL HULL.

Mr. GALLINGER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9028) granting an increase of pension to H. S. Reed, alias Daniel Hull, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

J. H. GALLINGER,
JAMES H. KYLE,
GEORGE TURNER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
HENRY R. GIBSON,
J. A. NORTON,
JOSEPH V. GRAFF,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

PROMOTION OF NAVAL OFFICERS.

Mr. CHANDLER. I offer a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no objection, the resolution will be received. It will be read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be directed to transmit to the Senate a list of the recommendations for promotion of naval officers made on January 18, 1899, by the naval board of which Rear-Admiral Sicard was president.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. CHANDLER. The resolution will go over.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It goes over; that is all. I want to look at it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution goes over under the rule.

BRIDGE ACROSS ROCK RIVER, ILLINOIS.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask leave to call up the bill (H. R. 12284) authorizing construction of bridge, and I desire to explain it in a word. The other day I had a bill passed, exactly a copy of this bill. It was a Senate bill, and it has gone to the House. I wish to have this bill passed now, and to recall the Senate bill so that this bill may become a law.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, on page 3, line 18, to strike out:

And it shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post roads of the United States.

And to insert:

Upon which also no higher charge shall be made for the transportation over the same of the mails, the troops, and the munitions of war of the United States than the rate per mile paid for transportation of said mails, troops, and munitions over the railroads and public highways leading to said bridge.

So as to read:

That the bridge built under this act, and subject to its limitations, shall be a lawful structure, and shall be known and recognized as a post route, upon which also no higher charge shall be made for the transportation over the same of the mails, the troops, and the munitions of war of the United States than the rate per mile paid for transportation of said mails, troops, and munitions over the railroads and public highways leading to said bridge; and equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph and telephone companies, and the United States shall have the right of way across said bridge and its approaches for postal-telegraph purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across Rock River, Illinois."

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the Senate bill (S. 5174) authorizing the construction of a bridge across Rock River, in the State of Illinois, which passed a few days since and which is exactly a copy of this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SEWELL. I ask leave to call up the Military Academy appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12846) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER. I submit an amendment to the bill which I ask may lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be so ordered.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask the indulgence of the Senator from New Jersey to allow me to call up a bridge bill that was reported today.

Mr. SEWELL. If it does not take more than a minute or two, I will yield, but I wish to have the Military Academy appropriation bill passed. It has been lying here for nearly a month.

Mr. PETTUS. It will take only a minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. SEWELL. If it does not take any time, I will yield.

BRIDGE ACROSS CHOCTAWHATCHEE RIVER, ALABAMA.

Mr. PETTUS. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 5814) to authorize the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala.

The Secretary read the bill; and, by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, page 1, line 10, after the word "railroad," to insert "provided such point selected shall, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, be suitable to the interests of navigation;" so as to make the section read:

That the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company, a corporation created and existing under the laws of the State of Kentucky, and doing business in the State of Alabama, its successors and assigns, be, and it is hereby, authorized and empowered to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala., at such point as may have been or may hereafter be selected by said railroad company for crossing said river on its line of railroad, provided such point selected shall, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, be suitable to the interests of navigation; that said bridge shall be constructed for the passage of railroad trains, and said railroad company may locate, construct, maintain, and operate over said bridge and the approaches thereto railroad tracks for the use of said railroad company.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, page 2, line 6, after the word "bridge," to insert "; and the United States shall have the right of way over said bridge for postal telegraph and telephone purposes;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That said bridge shall be a lawful structure, subject to the limitations of this act, and shall be recognized and known as a post route, upon which no higher charge shall be made for the transmission over the same of the mails, the troops, and munitions of war of the United States than the rate per mile to be paid for the same over the railroad leading to said bridge;

and the United States shall have the right of way over said bridge for postal telegraph and telephone purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 2, line 19, after the word "construction," to insert "or after its completion;" in line 20, after the words "Secretary of War," to insert "And any changes in said bridge which the Secretary of War may at any time deem necessary and order in the interests of navigation shall be made by the owners thereof, at their own expense;" in line 24, after the word "thereon," to insert "at its own expense," and, in line 25, after the word "be," to strike out "required by law" and insert "prescribed by the Light-House Board;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built and located subject to such regulations for the security of the navigation of said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe, and to secure that object the said railroad company shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawing of said bridge, with a map of the location thereof, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for the full and satisfactory understanding of the subject, and that said bridge shall not be built until the plans and location thereof shall be approved by the Secretary of War; and should any change be made in the plans of said bridge during the progress of its construction or after its completion, such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War; and any changes in said bridge which the Secretary of War may at any time deem necessary and order in the interests of navigation shall be made by the owners thereof at their own expense: *Provided*, That if said bridge is constructed as a drawbridge the draw thereof shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signal for the passage of boats, and the said railroad company shall maintain thereon at its own expense, between sunset and sunrise, such lights or other signals as may be prescribed by the Light-House Board.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert the following as a new section:

SEC. 4. That all railroad companies desiring the use of the bridge authorized by this act shall have and be entitled to equal rights and privileges relative to the passage of railway trains or cars over the same and over the approaches thereto upon the payment of a reasonable compensation for such use; and in case the owner or owners of said bridge and the several railroad companies, or any one of them, desiring such use, shall fail to agree upon the sum or sums to be paid, and upon rules and conditions to which each shall conform in using said bridge, all matters at issue between them shall be decided by the Secretary of War upon a hearing of the allegations and proofs of the parties; and equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph and telephone companies.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert the following as a new section:

SEC. 5. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the said bridge be not commenced in one year and completed in three years from the date hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert the following as a new section:

SEC. 6. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOEL BOWLING.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with a resolution of the Senate of the 2d instant (the House of Representatives concurring), I return herewith the bill of the Senate (S. 4276), entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Joel Bowling."

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, February 5, 1901.

B. R. HENRY AND OTHERS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

To the Senate:

In response to the resolution of the Senate of January 9, 1901, requesting copies of papers and information relating to the claims of B. R. Henry and other American citizens against the Government of Great Britain, I transmit herewith a report by the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,

Washington, February 5, 1901.

SPANISH CLAIMS COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2799) to carry into effect the stipulations of Article VII of the treaty between the United States and Spain, concluded on the 10th day of December, 1898; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 12333) to provide for the extension of the charter of national banks was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Is there not on the table from the House the Indian appropriation bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is on the table. The Chair was holding it on account of the absence of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. THURSTON].

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think I can state what his wishes are.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12904) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked by the House. The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. THURSTON, Mr. PLATT of Connecticut, and Mr. JONES of Arkansas were appointed.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the Military Academy appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. If that bill has been taken up, I will ask the Senator from New Jersey to yield to me for a moment.

Mr. SEWELL. I can not yield for the purpose of taking up any other bill. I have refused to yield to several Senators who desired the consideration of bills. I thought I had been very courteous in yielding in several instances. I can only yield for a motion or for a report from a committee.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I wanted to ask the Senate to take up a bill, and I was in hopes that the Senator from New Jersey would hear a brief statement as to its importance. It is a House bill proposing to put certain laws of Arkansas in force in the Indian Territory. It is a bill of only two or three pages, which has been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, and it will take less than three minutes to pass it. I should like very much to have it disposed of.

Mr. SEWELL. I must decline to yield under the circumstances. It will take only fifteen or twenty minutes to dispose of the Military Academy appropriation bill, and the Senator can come in with his bill after that.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I am very much obliged to the Senator for his liberality.

Mr. SEWELL. I want to say to the Senator that I would cheerfully yield to him, but I have been obliged to decline the request of two or three Senators.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. It may take more than a few minutes to pass the bill to which the Senator refers.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12846) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, which had been reported by the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. SEWELL. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the Committee on Military Affairs may be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments first receive consideration. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Permanent establishment," on page 2, after line 4, to insert:

Provided, That section 1319, chapter 4, Title XIV, of the Revised Statutes be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1319. Appointees shall be examined under regulations to be framed by the Secretary of War before they shall be admitted to the Academy and shall be required to be well versed in such subjects as he may, from time to time, prescribe."

Provided further, That the Superintendent of the Military Academy shall make such rules, to be approved by the Secretary of War, as will prevent the practice of hazing; and any cadet found guilty of participating in such practice shall be expelled from the Academy and shall not thereafter be reappointed to the corps of cadets or be eligible for appointment as a commissioned officer in the Army.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 1, before the word "mounted," to strike out "first lieutenant" and insert "captain;" so as to make the clause read:

For pay of 1 superintendent of the United States Military Academy (colonel), in addition to pay as captain, mounted, \$1,700.

This amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 3, to increase the ap-

propriation for the salary of "one commandant of cadets (lieutenant-colonel), in addition to pay as captain, not mounted," from \$1,200 to \$1,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 15, after the word "tactics," to insert "ordnance and gunnery, and practical military engineering;" so as to make the clause read:

For pay of 5 senior instructors of cavalry, artillery, and infantry tactics, ordnance and gunnery, and practical military engineering (captains), in addition to pay as first lieutenants, not mounted, \$2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 15, to insert:

Provided, That section 1278 of the Revised Statutes and sections 2 and 3 of the act approved March 3, 1877 (19 Statutes at Large, 380), are hereby repealed, and section 1111 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1111. The Military Academy Band shall hereafter consist of 1 teacher of music, who shall be the leader of the band, and of 40 enlisted musicians. The teacher of music shall receive the pay, allowances, and emoluments of a second lieutenant, not mounted; and of the enlisted musicians of the band, 12 shall each receive \$34 per month, 12 shall each receive \$25 per month, and the remaining 16 shall each receive \$17 per month, and each of the aforesaid enlisted men shall also be entitled to the clothing, fuel, rations, and other allowances of musicians of cavalry; and the said teacher of music and the enlisted musicians of the band shall be entitled to the same benefits in respect to pay, emoluments, and retirement arising from longevity, reenlistment, and length of service as are, or may hereafter become, applicable to other officers and enlisted men of the Army."

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, not being familiar with this matter, I should be glad if the Senator in charge of the bill would explain what are the sections of the Revised Statutes repealed by this bill—what they contain? I merely ask him to make a brief explanation, as I have not time to refer to the sections of the statutes. The provision is:

Provided, That section 1278 of the Revised Statutes and sections 2 and 3 of the act approved March 3, 1877 (19 Stat. L., 380) are hereby repealed, and section 1111 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows, etc.

There seems to be three sections of the law repealed absolutely and another modified. Of course, the modified section appears on the face of the bill, but I wish to know to what the sections proposed to be repealed relate.

Mr. SEWELL. The Military Academy Band is proposed to be increased from 24 to 40 pieces. Last year the appropriation was increased without giving any good reason for it, and the Secretary of War desires now to make it a matter of law, so as to cover it hereafter.

Section 1278 simply relates to the leader of the band at the Military Academy, and provides that he shall receive \$75 a month. This increases his pay to that of a second lieutenant.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Then the sections repealed merely relate to the matter which this amendment now covers?

Mr. SEWELL. That is all.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 5, line 17, to reduce the appropriation for the "salary per month of 12 enlisted musicians," from "\$30" to "\$25."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, line 15, after the word "Academy," to strike out "and commandant of cadets;" so as to make the clause read:

For extra pay of one enlisted man employed as clerk in the offices of the adjutant, United States Military Academy, at 50 cents per day, \$182.50.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 16, before the word "preceding," to insert "the nineteen;" so as to make the clause read:

Provided, That the extra pay provided by the nineteen preceding paragraphs shall not be paid to any enlisted man who receives extra-duty pay under existing laws or army regulations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 10, line 23, to increase the total appropriation for the "Permanent establishment of the Military Academy" from \$84,510.88 to \$84,790.88.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Pay of civilians," on page 11, line 2, to reduce the appropriation for "pay of the master of the sword" from \$1,600 to \$1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, after line 3, to insert.

Provided, That section 1338 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1338. The master of the sword shall hereafter act as instructor of military gymnastics and physical culture at the Military Academy, and shall have the relative rank and shall be entitled to the pay, allowances, and emoluments of a first lieutenant, mounted: *Provided, however*, That whenever a vacancy shall occur in the office of master of the sword and instructor of military gymnastics and physical culture the said office shall cease and determine, and the duties thereunto pertaining shall thereafter be performed by an officer of the line of the Army to be selected for that purpose by the Secretary of War."

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to the end of line 9 on page 13.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question for information. I know nothing about it, never having been to Westpoint, but on page 12, line 19, there is the following provision:

For pay of mechanic and attendant skilled in the technical preparations necessary to chemical and electrical lectures and to the instruction in mineralogy and geology, \$1,000.

Is there any teaching of mineralogy and geology at Westpoint?

Mr. SEWELL. Yes. It is necessary to have this employee in order to prepare for the demonstration to cadets.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I was not aware of that fact.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 18, after line 6, to insert:

For benches and raised platform for chemical lecture room, \$250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 23, after the word "dollars," to insert "to be immediately available," so as to make the clause read:

For cost of exchanging one Densmore typewriter, \$80, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, line 10, to increase the total appropriation for current and ordinary expenses of the Military Academy from \$79,535.55 to \$79,785.55.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 18, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one" and insert "three;" so as to make the paragraph read:

For maintaining and improving the grounds of the post cemetery, \$3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead of "Miscellaneous items and incidental expenses," on page 32, after line 7, to insert:

For two double sets of officers' quarters, to be of brick, with plumbing and heat, complete, \$40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 13, to insert:

For repairing roads and paths, including roads and bridges on reservation, \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 32, after line 20, to insert:

For building for officers' quarters and mess, \$29,960.

Provided, That the foregoing appropriation, and the appropriation contained in the act approved June 6, 1900, for building for officers' mess and quarters, \$78,990 are hereby made available until expended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, line 4, to increase the total appropriation for buildings and grounds at the Military Academy from \$185,190 to \$258,150.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. FORAKER. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. Amend by inserting after line 19, page 2, the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That section 4 of the act of June 6, 1900, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for other purposes," be so amended as to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. That the corps of cadets shall consist of 1 from each Congressional district, 1 from each Territory, 1 from the District of Columbia, 2 from each State at large, 4 from Porto Rico, not more than 1 of whom shall be appointed in any one year, and 30 from the United States at large. They shall be appointed by the President, and shall, with the exception of the 30 cadets appointed from the United States at large, be actual residents of the Congressional or Territorial districts, or of the District of Columbia, or of the States, respectively, from which they purport to be appointed."

Mr. COCKRELL. What change does that make, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. FORAKER. It makes simply this change: It provides that the cadet corps shall consist just as it now does, with the addition of four cadets from Porto Rico, not more than one of whom shall be appointed in any one year. That is the only change.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, it seems to me that two lines would express the amendment, if that is all the change.

Mr. FORAKER. That is all the change there is, and I put it the way I did simply that the whole legislation in regard to what the cadet corps shall consist of might be together.

Mr. PETTIGREW. As far as I am concerned, if this amendment is to be adopted, it will require some discussion, and therefore I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. SEWELL. I hope the Senator will withdraw that motion.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I shall not withdraw it unless the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. SEWELL. The consideration of the bill is about closed.

Mr. ALLEN. I desire to offer an amendment.

Mr. SEWELL. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio only admits four cadets from Porto Rico.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Let it be stated in a few words.

Mr. FORAKER. I can put it that way; but I followed the practice of the Senate last year when we amended the bill. Instead of providing for additional cadets they reenacted the whole section they wanted to amend with the amendment added.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I shall object, anyway.

Mr. FORAKER. I can change it, if that is all the objection the Senator has to the amendment.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I shall insist on my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from South Dakota, that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. SEWELL. I shall ask for the yeas and nays on that motion. I hope the Senator is not going to insist on the motion and break up the consideration of the bill.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It is no fault of mine when the Senator brings in an amendment involving the whole colonial policy.

Mr. SEWELL. Nobody is discussing it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It will lead to discussion.

Mr. SEWELL. I suggest that the Senator from Ohio frame the amendment so as to name its object, instead of including the whole corps of cadets.

Mr. FORAKER. It was my purpose to do that, simply because it was the practice followed last year to reenact the section applicable to the corps.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the page where the amendment is to be inserted?

Mr. FORAKER. On page 2 is where I ask to have it inserted.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask the Senator from South Dakota to withhold his motion for just a moment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota withdraw his motion for the present?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will withdraw it for a moment.

Mr. ALLEN. I have an amendment that I wish to offer. It is to add, as a new section, the following:

SEC. —. That each cadet, on entering the Academy, shall take and subscribe an oath that he will not, while a student therein, directly or indirectly, engage in hazing or countenance the same; and if during said time any cadet shall, directly or indirectly, engage in hazing or encourage or countenance the same, he shall be summarily expelled from said Academy and shall never thereafter be eligible to appointment to any office in the Army or Navy.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator will observe that there is a provision already in the bill covering that amendment.

Mr. ALLEN. But it is not as full as this.

Mr. SEWELL. If the Senator from Nebraska will look at the clause in the bill as it stands now—

Mr. ALLEN. I wanted to do more than that.

Mr. SEWELL. It is as strong as we could possibly make it.

Mr. ALLEN. I want him to take an oath and to do more than that.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator from New Jersey in charge of the bill that there is evidently more or less debate to be occasioned by these two amendments. Probably it will not last very long, but it is now past 6 o'clock and we have been here since 11 o'clock. The Senator has gotten along well with his bill, and I do not think there ought to be any further objection to the motion to adjourn.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not want to debate this amendment at length.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I suggest to the Senator from Nebraska to have his amendment printed and let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. ALLEN. Very well.

Mr. SEWELL. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to say a word to the Senator from Nebraska? I do not think the Senator from Nebraska really thinks those boys ought to take an oath.

Mr. ALLEN. Indeed I do.

Mr. CHANDLER. If they would subscribe to a promise, it would sound more sensibly than to require those boys to take an oath.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, a motion to adjourn is pending.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 6, 1901, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 4, 1901.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE.

Franklin Moses, of Alaska, to be register of the land office at St. Michael, Alaska.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Artillery arm.

Maj. E. Van Arsdale Andrus, Fourth Artillery, to be lieutenant-colonel, January 25, 1901.

Capt. Frank Thorp, Fifth Artillery, to be major, January 25, 1901.

First Lieut. John E. McMahon, Fourth Artillery, to be captain, January 25, 1901.

Second Lieut. Fox Conner, Second Artillery, to be first lieutenant, January 25, 1901.

POSTMASTERS.

Lou S. Flournoy, to be postmaster at Ruston, Lincoln Parish, La.

Louise Alvarez, to be postmaster at Covington, St. Tammany Parish, La.

C. J. Howard, to be postmaster at Cottage Grove, Lane County, Oreg.

James S. Thomson, to be postmaster at Lake Charles, Calcasieu Parish, La.

Euphemie Aucoin, to be postmaster at Thibodaux (late Thibodaux), Lafourche Parish, La.

Lorenzo S. Gardner, to be postmaster at Brunswick, Frederick County, Md.

Francis M. Scheble, to be postmaster at Wenatchee, Chelan County, Wash.

Felix R. Bray, to be postmaster at Jackson, Madison County, Tenn.

Berton M. Wooley, to be postmaster at Elsie, Clinton County, Mich.

Hugh W. Parker, to be postmaster at Bancroft, Shiawassee County, Mich.

Austin M. Robinson, to be postmaster at West, McLennan County, Tex.

Andrew W. Mars, to be postmaster at Berrien Springs, Berrien County, Mich.

Justin A. Harsh, to be postmaster at Tekonsha, Calhoun County, Mich.

Alfred S. Follansbee, to be postmaster at Ontonagon, Ontonagon County, Mich.

Richard C. Bullock, to be postmaster at Cherry Creek, Chautauqua County, N. Y.

George W. Armstrong, to be postmaster at Manlius, Onondaga County, N. Y.

Joseph F. Stephens, to be postmaster at Highland Falls, Orange County, N. Y.

Eugene M. Crosswait, to be postmaster at Earlham, Madison County, Iowa.

Oswell Z. Wellman, to be postmaster at Arlington, Fayette County, Iowa.

Marion O. Martin, to be postmaster at Honeoye Falls, Monroe County, N. Y.

Philip M. Mosher, to be postmaster at Riceville, Mitchell County, Iowa.

William W. De Long, to be postmaster at Eddyville, Wapello County, Iowa.

James F. Jordan, to be postmaster at Valley Junction, Polk County, Iowa.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 5, 1901.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come to Thee, O God, in the sacred attitude of prayer, that we may receive that moral and spiritual uplift which shall enable us to go forward with the duties of the day with patience, courage, and fortitude, that we may be in a condition to receive whatever comes to us of joy or sorrow, of pleasure or pain, victory or defeat.

We lift up our hearts in behalf of all who are sick and afflicted of our Congressional family, especially the gentleman from Georgia. We pray Thee that Thou wilt be with him to strengthen him and bring him back to us in health and strength. Hear us and so bless us. In the name of Christ our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE INDIAN RESERVATION, ARIZ.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following House bill with Senate amendments:

H. R. 10899. An act to restore to the public domain a small tract of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House non-concur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as managers on the part of the House Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHELDEN, and Mr. LITTLE.

JUDICIAL DISTRICTS IN KENTUCKY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 971) to divide Kentucky into two judicial districts, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. SMITH of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. CANNON in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post-Office appropriation bill, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] is recognized.

Mr. GRIGGS. Mr. Chairman, in their feverish hunt for big game the American people are about to overlook the "little foxes which may spoil the vine." Present conditions seem to be developing too many statesmen with views encompassing the universe and too few laborers in the field of home. Our glasses are adjusted too well for viewing distant questions and alien peoples for us to be able to see that which is clearly happening every day in our midst. At the risk of being called a small caliber or a smoothbore I propose to ask the House of Representatives to "draw in its sights," at least temporarily, and take a passing glance at domestic concerns wholly disconnected from war and conquest, free from the glamor and glory of world-wide expansion, but fully as dangerous to American institutions. I presume that my remarks will render me persona non grata in several branches of the public service, and I ought to say in the beginning that I have the very highest respect for the office-holding class of American citizens.

I do not refer to that class alone which is elected by the popular vote; that class is but an echo. I refer to the appointive, executive, and departmental class of Government officials; employees, if you please, who are in the main good citizens, honest, earnest, and faithful in the discharge of their duties; and the criticism which I shall make upon some of the fungi which have fastened on the body politic of late years is against the system rather than on individuals. For these people, whether in the Departments at Washington or in the service elsewhere, I say that I have the highest respect, and I regret the necessity of placing myself in what may seem to them a hostile attitude. But when a question like this arises, appealing as I see it to the courage and patriotism of the legislators, it becomes the duty of everyone representing a constituency upon this floor to speak the truth as he sees it.

I concede in the outset that our civil service—and I mean by the term civil service to include all civil employees of the United States—is one of the most efficient, honest, and faithful in the world. Education acquired by long years of experience adds to its efficiency, and undoubtedly every day of service increases the usefulness of the individual employed. Admitting all this, Mr. Chairman, I must, however much I regret the necessity, call the attention of Congress and the country to the imminent danger to our institutions from the great and growing number of organizations of Government employees, every one of which, so far as I am informed, is engaged in an effort to increase the salaries of the members thereof.

There is now a bill before this House—indeed, several bills of like character have been introduced, but I refer in particular to one which has been partially considered—authorizing, in one of the bureaus of one of the great Departments of this Government, the establishment of what is practically a civil pension for the aged and disabled employees of that bureau. It provides that 3 per cent of the salaries of all employees shall be reserved to make a retirement fund, which is to be used to support employees who, by the weight of advancing years or the inroads of disease, may become incapacitated for further service.

Gentlemen insist that this is not a pension. Then I ask them, Mr. Chairman, what is it? If we are paying larger salaries to these employees than are needed, it is our duty to the people that we represent to decrease those salaries in whatever proportion they now exceed just and equitable recompense for service rendered. If they are too small, then it is our duty to our constituencies and to these employees to increase their salaries to an amount commensurate with the labor performed.

On that point, Mr. Chairman, I undertake to say that there is not an employee of this Government who devotes his entire time to its service who does not receive greater pay than he would for like service in private life. There is not an employee in the Government service to-day who did not better his or her condition when he or she entered it. There is not one who, if he could

better his condition to-morrow, would not resign and enter upon other employment.

Then why this paternal interest so often displayed upon this floor in Government employees? All of them are free men and women of full age. Why should we make them wards of the nation? How is this fatherly interest of legislators, so lately aroused in what seems to me a cancerous growth, to be accounted for? It may be, and I believe is, largely due to the unions, associations, and conventions among Government employees of almost every class, organized ostensibly, and probably at the outset really, for the laudable purpose of increasing the efficiency of the service, but every one of which it seems is bound, sooner or later, to degenerate into a society for the purpose of promoting legislation favorable to themselves.

It began, I believe, Mr. Chairman, with a union of employees in the Railway Mail Service, organized at the outset as a purely social and benevolent society, the object of which primarily was to furnish insurance to employees at a lower rate than they could secure it from the regular accident and insurance companies. So far as I am concerned, I have the very highest admiration for the employees in the Railway Mail Service. The employees in that service are in the main patriotic, trustworthy, honest, and in every sense efficient men; and for one I should not be opposed to a reclassification of the service and the payment of salaries commensurate with the labor performed and the dangers endured.

But, Mr. Chairman, this, probably the most efficient branch of the Government service—this, our great army of peace, carrying civilization, enlightenment, and religion throughout all the world to all the people—has no right to organize for the purpose of changing the relation of its employees to the Government which employs them. Let us look at it for a moment. They receive salaries running from \$800 to \$1,400 per annum. They average seven and one-half working hours per day, of which two hours on alternate days are presumed to be devoted to study. The average of salaries paid by the United States to railway postal clerks below the grade of chief clerk is \$1,062.30 per annum—at least a fair salary for seven and a half hours' work per day, two hours of which on alternate days are presumed to be devoted to the study of their work.

I constantly receive letters headed like this:

National Association of Railway Postal Clerks.

Then usually follows a list of committees, chief among which in every instance is the "legislative committee." A position on this committee seems to be as much sought after in those organizations as a position on the Ways and Means or Appropriations Committee in this House.

I quote:

Our bill has passed the Senate.

Our bill!

Our bill has passed the Senate a number of times, to be ignored a hearing by Tom Reed, ex-Speaker, etc., at various sessions. Let me assure you the bill is an honest one, or it would not have the indorsement of the Department, which it has.

I do not doubt that these gentlemen are honest in their intentions; I do not doubt that their bill is an honest bill; but I do doubt—I do deny—the propriety, the right of employees, in whatever branch of the service they may be engaged and however efficient their services may be, to organize and demand legislation of any character at the hands of Congress.

Here is another:

Resolutions adopted by railway postal clerks, Louisville, Ky., April 16, 1900.

This is a protest against an effort of the Post-Office Committee to reclassify the service to a certain extent a year ago. Those who send us these resolutions say that the reclassification as attempted by the Post-Office Committee benefited but a few of the clerks, without any reference to its benefit to the service.

Signed by a committee—signed by a president—signed by a secretary.

And here, Mr. Chairman, is another, to which I wish to call your attention:

Hon. JAMES M. GRIGGS, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

This is dated Chicago, December 3, 1900, and is in the following language:

As representatives of the 9,000 railway postal clerks in the United States, we again solicit your assistance in our efforts to obtain legislation for the benefit of the Railway Mail Service and the employees thereof. * * *

Now, Mr. Chairman, whatever might have been the object of the society at the very beginning—at its inception—however laudable its purposes and intentions might have been, it has at last come to a point where the sole business and the sole purpose and function of the association seem to be the promotion of legislation before Congress beneficial to the members of the association.

What would you say, gentlemen, to an organization of American soldiers in the Philippine Islands sending their representatives here to demand an increase of their pay? Two years ago an American army was encamped in the island of Cuba. They had

just won a victory which ended a war. Unaccustomed to the torrid climate, that dread scourge of the Tropics—yellow fever—was stalking a veritable pestilence through the camp. Something was necessary to be done. The necessity for action—speedy action—was urgent.

Finally it was decided to frame and forward a protest against remaining longer there to the Commander in Chief of the Armies of the United States, the President of the United States. How was that accomplished? No officer in all of that army, not even the terror of the Western mountain lions—the strenuous Vice-President-elect of the United States—dared sign his name first, and thus assume responsibility for this act. It was finally signed in a complete circle, without beginning and without end, and this is the famous "round robin" of the American Army, and the secret of its existence.

No private soldier would have dared to do even this. This protest came from soldiers, from men whose lives were in the balance, and whose health was dependent, as they believed, on their removal from that death-dealing climate.

The American civil employees, in no danger from anything, according to gentlemen who advocate pensions and increases of pay for him, except old age and his own extravagance, organizes and sends a walking delegate here to interview Congress in his behalf. The soldier, having faced death in battle and a thousandfold worse from disease, must remain mute.

I am, Mr. Chairman, in receipt, and every member of the Post-Office Committee is in a like condition, constantly of communications headed "National Letter-Carriers' Association," "Association of Railway Mail Clerks," "Associated Post-Office Clerks," and associated clerks of all sorts and sizes, kinds, and descriptions, signed by some official as secretary or president, or both as secretary and president, insisting that his particular branch of the public service should be reclassified or equalized. Everyone of them insists upon equalizing up and not one of them on equalizing down. It does not seem ever to have occurred to them that this equalization or classification might go both ways. They do not seem to appreciate the fact that it might go up or might go down. They all want it equalized the same way. They always insist on leveling up.

Now, I do not undertake to say, Mr. Chairman, that the letter carriers of the United States are not entitled to an equalization of their service. I am not now discussing that question. But I do undertake to say that no employee, be he a letter carrier or a railway mail clerk, has the right to enter into a union to force legislation through this body.

Let us look at the work of the letter carriers for a moment. They average about seven and a half hours' work a day and receive from \$600 to \$1,000 salary per annum. They also receive fifteen days' leave of absence during the year. The average salary of the letter carrier employed in the service of the United States is \$903.96. That is a fair compensation, at least, Mr. Chairman, for messenger service, for that is what it is, neither more nor less. To equalize them as urged would add \$3,741,350 annually to the Post-Office appropriation bill.

As I have said, \$900 per annum is at least fair pay for messenger service. They insist, however, that the class of men in the service are worth more than this, their average salary. If so, let them get out of the service and make it elsewhere. If they are worth it, it could be easily done. This salary brought them into the service; let its inadequacy take them out of it. I have so many letters from carriers that it would be useless to take up the time of the House to read them to you. I propose to read you, however, just a few extracts on this line. I am going to read you first from the letter of the president of the Carriers' Association in the United States to the members of the association in the April number, 1900, of the Postal Record:

Our members should bear in mind this fact, that at this time and in this particular stage of our affairs there is very little time to spare in discussing with our members anything pertaining to our work here—

That is, in Washington—

feeling that it will be time enough after the matter has been disposed of to inform you in detail everything connected with the affair. Just now our talk, both through the columns of the Postal Record and through our friends at home, and through their friends whom they can reach, should be directed to the members of Congress from their respective districts, and their talk with them should be plain and to the point; that we know no reason why this salary bill should not be placed upon the statute books, and we are in no humor of being jollied any longer by lame excuses as to why this has not been done. For myself, I but want to reiterate to you the statement made at our Scranton convention, and to the carrying out of which our organization has been pledged—that if we can not pass the increase of salary bill at this session of Congress, there is no hope of ever passing it; and I again assure you that I will have no excuse to offer and will endeavor to inform you as to just where the responsibility should be placed.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GRIGGS. With pleasure.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. What is the date of that?

Mr. GRIGGS. April, 1900.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Last year?

Mr. GRIGGS. Yes. This is a copy of the Postal Record, published by the Carriers' Association of the United States in the city of Washington, edited by a gentleman by the name of Cantwell. This is the letter of the president of that association, Mr. Parsons, to the members thereof, written in April, 1900.

Mr. HEDGE. Written here in Washington.

Mr. GRIGGS. Written, I presume, from Washington; yes. I have another one here. When we have representatives of these associations before our committee advocating their legislation, the question has been asked of some of them, "Do you never threaten members of Congress for their opposition?" to which every member of the Post-Office Committee will remember the reply always made is "Never." If what I have read is not a threat, a public and direct threat, of a determination to do something to such members as will not comply with their demands, then no court on earth ever was able or ever will be able to determine what is a threat in any criminal matter that may come before it.

Let me read you a very unique, the most unique paper I have ever received in connection with all these matters. It is a parallel column of comparisons between the post-office clerks and the carriers. These gentlemen are all nice gentlemen, they are men of sense and ability, they are all men who know how to approach you in a gentlemanly way, and they know how to jolly you when it is necessary, to compliment you when it is necessary, and they know when to stay away from you. They are good fellows. I know all of them, and I have heard some of them say that they could not understand how the post-office clerks would make such an attack as this upon their brethren who are engaged in the same business; that is, I presume, the business of promoting legislation increasing salaries. Here is the comparison in parallel columns between the two classes of employees.

LETTER CARRIER.

1. *Protection.*—Protected by laws of the most positive and mandatory character, passed by Congress.

2. *Salaries.*—Salaries fixed and determined by length of service.

First year	\$600
Second year	800
Third year	1,000

No deviation is possible from the above time and amounts.

3. *Working hours.*—Eight (8) hours (no more, under penalty of suspension) constitute a day's work.

4. *Punishment.*—Carriers are suspended (that is, they are given a holiday without pay).

5. *Requirements of duty.*—To learn one district, no study off duty. No examinations. An intelligent man could serve a district in some fashion the first day in the service. An ordinary district could be well learned in a month.

6. *Health.*—Subject to exposure in severe weather.

Healthful occupation physically, with but few exceptions.

7. *Vacations.*—The law requires that every carrier shall be given fifteen days' vacation a year. A substitute is provided during said vacation and paid out of money provided for that purpose.

POST-OFFICE CLERK.

1. *Protection.*—Unprotected by law; salaries and positions regulated by Post-Office Department, or at the will of local postmaster.

2. *Salaries.*—Salaries not regulated by any rule, but generally dealt out according to amount of influence the clerk can bring to bear on the postmaster.

First year, \$300, \$400, \$500, or \$600. Second year, sometimes less than first.

No certainty of increase. Can be kept at above amounts or raised to \$1,400, or can be reduced from \$1,400 to \$600, or any amount between the two.

3. *Working hours.*—Eight, nine, ten, or twelve hours, as superintendents see fit to exact, constitute a day's work.

4. *Punishment.*—Clerks are fined (that is, they are obliged to work without pay).

5. *Requirements of duty.*—To learn all districts in a city, or all post-offices in a State or the United States. Postal laws; constant study to keep abreast of changes. Yearly or semi-yearly examinations. It is impossible for a new man to do the work in any manner the first day. Six months of practice and study required to make an ordinary clerk.

6. *Health.*—Protected from the weather. Physically the work of the clerk is much more exhausting to the system. Mentally there is no comparison.

7. *Vacations.*—The postmaster may or may not grant the clerk fifteen days' vacation; no compulsion whatever. A great many clerks never receive a day's vacation, on account of insufficient force to allow such privilege. When the clerk is granted a vacation there is no substitute provided in his place, but the balance of the regular force must do the work between themselves.

Every man who comes here with a bill always calls it "our bill." One of these carriers has gone so far, something in the sunny clime of Georgia has so affected him mentally—whether or not it is the sap that rises on the brain in the springtime or something else I know not—but this carrier has gone off into poetry on the subject. I read it:

A TOAST TO THE BOYS IN GRAY.

Sung to the tune of "The Old Crow Crossed the Road."

Here's a health, boys in gray,
Wherever you may be found!
Maine, California, Texas, Iowa—
Here's to you, drink 'er down.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. That is moonshine.

Mr. GRIGGS (reading)—

Here's a health, boys in gray,
A-hopin' for twelve hundred a year.
All the same, short pay or long pay,
You'll allus be busted, I fear.

Here's a health, boys in gray!
Hope you'll be here many a Monday,
And I'll never miss a single day,
And never fail to punch old Bundy.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. Do you not think it is moonshine down there?

Mr. GRIGGS. Possibly; they say they make it good down there. Mr. Chairman, we are constantly in receipt of communications from post-office clerks in the United States, a body organized for what declared purpose I know not. I presume from the circular just read that the carriers think for attack upon them, which might be called one trust attacking another. For what declared purpose they have organized, I say, I have been unable to ascertain; but they insist as an organization that they shall be protected by a change of the law and an increase of salary. These post-office clerks, if anybody has a case before Congress, have the best case of any. They work more hours and receive on the average less pay than the employees in any other branch of the postal service.

What next? I presume members of this House on the Post-Office Committee besides myself have seen dropped gently in front of them from the hands of the doorkeeper often here a little card with a name on it, and following the name "President of the Association of Fourth-class Postmasters of the United States, 70,000 strong."

Mr. LOUD. Seventy thousand votes.

Mr. GRIGGS. And 70,000 strong they have been marching on Congress since its organization, about two years ago. I know they have grievances, Mr. Chairman; but we all have grievances, and Congress was never established as a panacea for grievances of governmental employees or anybody else, except the grievances and the wrongs of the people of the country at large. It grieves me to have to pay at a hotel in the city of Washington twice as much board as my secretary would have to pay for the same service and the same attention. That, I presume, is one of the penalties of greatness, however, and I accept it as such and uncomplainingly pay it.

A large majority of the fourth-class post-offices were established only as a convenience for the people of the neighborhood; and almost every merchant in the small villages of the country would gladly undertake the work of the office for nothing, on account of the increased trade it would bring to them. A great many of these post-offices were established for the benefit of the postmaster himself, who has a country store, and wishes, besides receiving his own mail, to gain the trade the post-office naturally brings.

Mr. William H. Thomas is the president of this national league—I called it "association." I apologize to the gentleman for it, "League!" They all have different names.

Mr. MANN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GRIGGS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Has the gentleman had called to his attention a recent copy of a confidential circular sent out by Mr. Thomas?

Mr. GRIGGS. I do not know; I have had so many. I will say to my friend from Illinois I have received so many circulars of all sorts and sizes that I have not made even an effort to keep up with them.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit me, one of the fourth-class postmasters in my district, and I have not very many, sent me this circular, which I hold in my hand.

Mr. GRIGGS. I do not want to be discourteous to my friend—

Mr. MANN. I think it will help you.

Mr. HOPKINS. It is the line you are discussing, and we will give you an extension of time.

Mr. GRIGGS. All right.

Mr. MANN. This circular includes this paragraph, that seems to throw a great deal of light on Mr. Thomas's occupation:

There is no fund on hand to cover expenses. If you wish me to go, please send one or two dollars, which will be entered as a credit on your dues to the national league.

Mr. GRIGGS. I was coming to that, but not in that way. I am glad my friend from Illinois has called my attention to it. I understood that their dues were a dollar a year, but I think it started out with the idea of \$5 dues.

Mr. MANN. It strikes me as one way of defrauding the poor people in the country for the purpose of robbing them of their money. It beats the green-goods game all to pieces. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. A line here, which he prints in big black letters nearly a foot square, is this: "Now, look yourself fairly in the face and answer these questions." From having seen the president of this association, I believe he is a man who could come nearer doing what he advises the fourth-class postmaster to do than any man I ever saw.

I read further:

Isn't this a violation of a contract by the Government? And isn't your claim for the return of this money righteous and just?

This money they claim from the Government is what they claim to have lost by their failure at some time to have the privilege of canceling the stamps on letters mailed possibly on the train, possibly at some other post-office not fourth-class. He is a pretty clever sort of a fellow, however, and he makes three or four propositions to us on the same sheet of paper. Like the boy who went to town with the eggs to sell, he said, "Dad told me to ask you 20 cents a dozen, and if you would not give that to take 15." He first comes with a proposition that would take a million dollars per annum out of the Treasury, and he comes next with the proposition to take \$375,000, and says if you can not give us the million, give us the \$375,000. I presume, having been unable to get there, he has adopted the plan suggested by my friend from Illinois and gone out on a raid on the fourth-class postmasters.

Do not talk to me about fourth-class postmasters' hardships. I am too well acquainted with them and their work. I have many friends among them, but I do say they are the best paid men for the work they do in all this land. But I am not now discussing the question of salaries or pay or of hardships of employees. The proposition which I wish I could make clear to every taxpayer in this land is this—that employees of this Government, agents of the people, supported by the people, have no right to organize as against the legislative agents of the same people for whom they are performing service, and who pay the taxes by which they are sustained.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GRIGGS. Certainly.

Mr. TAWNEY. What particular employees have effected an organization such as the gentleman describes?

Mr. GRIGGS. I am sorry my friend came in so late, or did not listen after he did come in. I have enumerated each class as I came along.

Mr. TAWNEY. Post-office clerks and letter carriers?

Mr. GRIGGS. And the railway mail clerks.

Mr. TAWNEY. Do you mean to say that the railway mail clerks have an organization like that you describe? If you do, I want to correct you. It is a benevolent association. It has not been used for the purpose you describe, and by a resolution adopted at the last convention there has been no fund raised for the purpose of prosecuting any legislation affecting the railway postal clerks of the United States.

Mr. GRIGGS. Then what does this mean?

CHICAGO, ILL., December 31, 1900.

DEAR SIR: As representatives of the 9,000 railway postal clerks of the United States, we again solicit your assistance in order to obtain legislation for the benefit of the railway mail service and employees therein.

C. L. SCHAEFFER, President.

Hon. JAMES M. GRIGGS,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. TAWNEY. No person disputes the proposition that they have written letters. Would you deny an employee the right that any citizen has to write a letter to a Representative in Congress?

Mr. GRIGGS. No, sir, I would not; I would not deny the right of petition to any American citizen. I would not even deny it to a Filipino. But I do deny the right of officials employed by this Government to organize for the purpose of forcing or influencing any sort of legislation in this body.

Mr. TAWNEY. The letter which you read, written by the president of the association, does not prove your statement, so far as it relates to the railway postal clerks, because there is no evidence in the letter that the association was formed for the purpose of influencing legislation in its behalf.

Mr. GRIGGS. My friend says it does not prove what I claim. I hope I have in this House and in the people of the United States a more impartial if not a more intelligent jury to pass upon this question than is my friend from Minnesota. I did not say—and if my friend had paid attention to my remarks or had been present and listened to them—I did not say the organization of the railway mail clerks was formed for the purpose of influencing legislation. I said it was formed as a benevolent association and I stated the purpose for which it was formed, that of furnishing insurance to its members, but I said it had of late years degenerated into a society for the purpose of influencing legislation in their behalf. That is what I said; and if this letter does not prove that, then I do not know what proof is.

Mr. TAWNEY. One other question, if the gentleman pleases. Does he object to the heads of Departments asking Congress for the legislation which the railway postal clerks are asking for?

Mr. GRIGGS. The Departments?

Mr. TAWNEY. The Postmaster-General, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and the Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service.

Mr. GRIGGS. No.

Mr. TAWNEY. Are they not asking Congress for the same legislation that the railway postal clerks are asking; and do they

constitute an organization for the purpose of influencing legislation?

Mr. GRIGGS. Is my friend through?

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. GRIGGS. One of the duties of the Postmaster-General is to advise Congress as to the legislation needed in his Department; and if my friend will point out to me one line of law which names as any duty of any employee under him in the Post-Office Department to advise Congress, I will apologize for all I have said and vote with the gentleman to raid the Treasury in all directions.

As I was going on to say when my friend from Minnesota interrupted me, gentlemen may ask whether I propose to deny to these employees the right of petition guaranteed them under the Constitution. (I presume that the "Constitution follows" these fellows, no matter where they may go.) I would not deny them any right, Mr. Chairman. If they have grievances, if they suffer wrongs which they wish to have redressed, let them petition Congress as individuals, as free men, not as bound members of an association or society which is entirely foreign to the spirit of our institutions. An employee is an official just as much as the head of a bureau or department is. He is an officer of this Government just as a Senator or Member of Congress is. We are all on the firing line, and under our oaths it is the duty of all of us to stand for the interest of the people. It is not our duty as members of Congress to stand for the interest of that body of which we are members; it is not the duty of a Senator to look out for the interests of the Senate, but to fight for the interests of all the people—the people who "pay the freight."

Let me say here that I am not opposed to labor unions, trade federations, and the like. Under modern conditions, with great aggregations of capital in the hands of soulless corporations, these combinations of labor seem a necessity. So long as the contest was man against man, everyone could protect himself, be he laborer or be he capitalist. But since it has come to a condition in which dollars herd together and the man is no longer able alone to stand against them, it is perfectly proper for laborers to organize themselves against the tyranny of congested capital.

But what of the Government official, Mr. Chairman? Against whom does he organize? Is he organized against capital? He is organized against supposed oppression or wrong somewhere. He is necessarily organized against the Government of the United States. The Government is merely the agent of the people. He is not only himself one of the agents of the people, but he is one of the people. Whenever such organized effort is made by Government employees to bring pressure on Congress for the purpose of changing their relations to the Government, they are engaged in an effort to coerce not only Congress, but the people of the United States. That which would be denounced as treason and conspiracy on the part of soldiers is commended as a patriotic effort to redress wrongs on the part of civil employees.

The great body of the people, Mr. Chairman, do not draw from the Treasury of this Government for their support; on the contrary, the Treasury draws on their resources, and they must pay the draft. Should the entire officeholding class become organized into a great body of salary grabbers, making its annual demands on Congress, it would not be a case of the labor union protecting its members against the aggressions of capital; it would be rather the aggregation of capital oppressing labor. It would be the salaried man against the unsalaried man, who must meet whatever demands the Government makes upon him. Once in two years only has he the opportunity of declaring his approval or disapproval of our acts. The Government employee is perennial in his demands. He is an ever-blooming rose, Mr. Chairman.

There are about 300,000 employees in this Government. If once thoroughly organized and voting solidly, they could turn the scales in any Presidential election. In almost every Congressional district in the United States an active organization of Government employees may be able now to turn the scales at every election. Suppose it should come to this, Mr. Chairman, where would the free representatives of the American people stand? Instead of being, as they have always boasted themselves to be, free and independent representatives of a free people, they would come here bound hand and foot, the mere puppets of organized officeholders.

We are seeking to extend the benefits of rural mail delivery over the United States. The extension of this service has been to me a labor of love since I have had the honor to sit in this House. It is due to some of my friends in the House and to the creator of the latest Republican platform that I should disclaim any pretension to the fatherhood of this service. I am content with playing the benevolent stepfather. But, Mr. Chairman, when I look forward to the time when in every county in every Congressional district of this country there will be from 10 to 100 mail carriers organized into a vast body 150,000 strong, ostensibly for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the service, but really working day and night to increase the salaries of themselves and to fight

the Representative who will not bow to their behests, I see danger to American institutions.

My hope is, Mr. Chairman, that the strong common sense and patriotism of the American people, which has stood them in good stead during so many crises in the past, may be aroused before that day comes, and that these organizations which, whatever their original purpose, incidentally or accidentally degenerate into organizations for the purpose of increasing salaries will be crushed out, and that every man in the service, as well as out of it, may stand upon his own bottom, and that his highest hope and his highest ambition will be, whether in or out of office, to be a free and independent liberty-loving American citizen. As a sentinel on the watchtower, I simply call attention to the threatened danger. The people themselves must apply the remedy.

All classes of postmasters in the United States are now organized into what they call a convention for the alleged purpose of increasing the efficiency of the service. They got up too high to be "a league" or "an association," but have organized "a convention," and they have favored the Department with their photographs. We have all seen photographs of the last convention hanging around in the city of Washington. They are organized for an alleged purpose of increasing, as are all, the efficiency of the service. Why, Mr. Chairman, such an organization of postmasters is an absolute absurdity. Just consider for a moment! I have noticed in the newspapers as one of the resolutions adopted by this convention an indorsement of the St. Louis fair, a most laudable enterprise, but, as I understand it, totally disconnected from the Post-Office Department of the United States or from the postal service in any way.

Another resolution which I understand was adopted was one favoring the extension of the pneumatic-tube service—a service which, if continued at all, will necessarily and naturally be confined to a few of the largest cities and a service about which the postmasters throughout the country generally have neither the time nor the means of obtaining information of any character. A union of carpenters is a union of men of a certain class of citizens who are performing their life work. It is their trade, undertaken by them in their young manhood, for the promotion of an interest by which they propose to provide for themselves and their families throughout life. They are organized into a union to protect their trade and to protect themselves. But what of an association of postmasters? Why, it would be an anomaly. The postmaster, as my friend from New Haven sitting opposite to me [Mr. SPERRY] can probably testify—the postmaster is a peripatetic individual, who lingers during the lifetime of the Administration which appoints him.

His life is like the summer rose
That opens to the morning sky,
But ere the shades of evening close
Is scattered on the ground—to die.

[Laughter.]

He might start to a convention as a member thereof, aye, even as the president of the convention, and find himself on arrival at the place of meeting a last year's bird's nest, as I am credibly informed one president found himself not long ago, ex officio, and without any functions of any kind. One swing of the official ax here would accomplish this end.

I hold in my hand some of their resolutions. Here they are. Members can see them. It is a national association, as we are informed, and I beg to call your attention to certain proposed legislation in the alleged interests of the postal service of the United States. In order to catch the chairman of the Post-Office Committee at the outset (but I may pause to say that they did not get him; he is too cunning an old fox to be caught in that way) [laughter] they began on abuses in second-class mail matter, the "Loud bill."

Why, Mr. Chairman, I can see those postmasters now as they passed their resolutions, their countenances beaming and their hearts overflowing with good feeling toward the whole world and especially toward themselves. They said: "Now we have got Loud. We are ready to proceed; we are all right. We will go on and accomplish the 'reforms' that we have in mind." The next thing they do is to resolute on appropriations for clerk hire. The next is an emergency appropriation for the interest of the service. The next resolution is for the eight-hour law. They are working too hard and working too long. The next is with reference to the mail-wagon service, and so they go on through the entire list. They recommend that the regulations be so changed with reference to biddings and contracts that they shall be restricted to persons residing on the line of the route.

Mr. LOUD. Trying to catch all classes.

Mr. GRIGGS. Trying to catch everybody. Well, I presume as they found that they did not catch the chairman, and they did not catch the "other boys," they have decided to let recommendations to Congress alone. I hope so, and I may be permitted to say that this is a most laudable determination on their part.

A MEMBER. They seem to have caught TAWNEY. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. Well, I do not know about that.

But, Mr. Chairman, what has been said in reference to postmasters may be said of a great many of the postal clerks—I mean the post-office clerks. The civil service gives practically a life tenure to letter carriers, railway mail clerks, Department clerks, and to that extent their office is their trade. The postmaster, on the other hand, may be a private citizen to-morrow, and because of the constant change in the personnel of this office his organization can not become a very dangerous menace to American institutions.

But, Mr. Chairman, should all officeholders at last go under civil-service rules, with a life tenure on their offices, and finally become organized into a great body of salary grabbers, 500,000 strong, I would tremble for the safety of the Government of this Republic.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MONDELL). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may conclude his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GRIGGS] be allowed to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIGGS. I thank my friend from Illinois and the House for the courtesy, and will be pleased to answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania if I can.

Mr. MAHON. I have listened to the gentleman very attentively in his argument, and I agree with a great deal of it. Now, I ask him to answer this question: There was a bill here for the codification of the postal laws. If this evil exists and is growing, why did not the committee put in your codification provisions prohibiting things of this sort, making them cause for dismissal?

Mr. GRIGGS. I will tell my friend why we did not do that. A recodification of the postal laws was a necessity. Speedy action was necessary. It had been so long since the laws had been codified that it was necessary for us to act on the subject at once, and the committee agreed that it would be impossible if we went into all the abuses we thought existed in this Department, because we could not go into one without going into all; that the bill would die aborning, and we would still be without the needed codification of the postal laws.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him, while he is thus diverted from the course of his remarks?

Mr. GRIGGS. With pleasure. Always go right ahead with any questions you wish to ask.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman does not touch upon it anywhere else in his speech, I should like to ask him what is the effect of the civil-service laws in protecting employees of the Government and their organizations for the purpose of increasing salaries? In other words, if they were not protected, would they form these organizations?

Mr. GRIGGS. I am going to give my opinion on that, but I can answer the question now. I think the civil service of the United States is the greatest humbug of all the ages. That is my opinion of that.

I repeat, the postmaster of to-day is a private citizen to-morrow, and because of constantly changing personnel his league can not become very dangerous to American institutions. But, Mr. Chairman, should all officeholders at last get under the civil-service rules with a life tenure on their offices, and finally become organized into a great body of salary grabbers, I would tremble for the safety of this Republic.

I represent here farmers, merchants, lawyers, mechanics, traders, bankers, preachers, doctors. I represent also railway mail clerks, postmasters, post-office clerks, and letter carriers. The pay of every class of these officeholders is far better than that of the average private citizen. Should the representative of all be controlled by the organization of the few? I am perfectly willing to admit that there are inequalities in every branch of the Government service. I am willing to admit for the sake of argument that members of the service in every section thereof have many wrongs, but, Mr. Chairman, I insist that the resignation door is wide open always to all who can not be pleased with the offices they hold. [Applause.]

There are inequalities here. I sometimes find myself tolerated where my friend from California [Mr. LOUD] is most welcome. That is not my fault, but his good fortune, and I do not envy him in it, and I shall not make an effort to organize a convention in order to make me as welcome in certain parts of the city of Washington as my friend from California is. There are inequalities between members of this House and members of the other body at the other end of this building. When I was a private citizen I thought a judge of the circuit court was the grandest man on earth. That was about as far as I had seen. I afterwards aspired to the judgeship, and the bench fell to my level. After association with circuit judges for a number of years, I found

that a judge of the circuit court in Georgia was no bigger man than any other citizen of Georgia, except possibly the member of Congress. I aspired to that, and reached this, to me, high goal. Since associating with members here from every State and every corner of the Union, I find that a member of Congress is no better than the average citizen of Georgia and no bigger than the average citizen of Georgia, and I have at last arrived at the conclusion that the Presidency of the United States is not as grand and great an office as I used to think it was. But left alone in grand and gloomy glory, the Senator of the United States yet remains the superior of everybody on God's green earth except some other Senator. [Laughter.]

Mr. BURKE of Texas. Has the gentleman aspirations in that direction?

Mr. GRIGGS. I am not going to resign from the House, and I am not going to organize this House into an association for the purpose of promoting legislation to make a member of the House as good as a Senator, because my honest opinion is that all truly good members of the House finally land in the Senate, if they live long enough. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if these gentlemen can not be pleased, if these employees do not like it, then, as was once said by a distinguished Georgian, "If they do not like the taste, let them pour it back in the jug," and we will find some one else who will gladly take up the task they thus lay down.

Mr. MAHON. A Georgian never does that. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRIGGS. I think he felt perfectly safe that his advice would not be acted on, just as I do to-day. Labor organizes to protect the individual, and no man questions its right. Office-holders, liable to go out with every passing breeze of public opinion, unite not for the purpose of protecting man against oppression, but to advance themselves and their interests against the rights and interests of the people, the owners of the offices. They organize to tax the people for the benefit of offices which may be filled by them to-day and others to-morrow. If given the opportunity, I would undertake to fill every Government office with competent men who would be willing to accept the salaries now paid and who would enter into a solemn agreement to join no society or organization which has for its object, either directly or indirectly, incidentally or accidentally, intentionally or unintentionally, the increase of salaries.

It makes me tired, Mr. Chairman, to listen to sympathetic twaddle over "men grown gray in the Government service." It is said that it is impossible to get rid of many who, after long service, borne down by the weight of advancing years and the inroads of disease, have become incapacitated for efficient service. My sympathies go out, Mr. Chairman, to every man in office and out of office who, stricken in years, is unable to perform the service necessary for his sustenance. But, Mr. Chairman, at the same time my mind reverts to the great body of citizens throughout the United States who labor day in and day out from year to year and who must depend upon the uncertainties of the weather, the rains and the sunshine, who must work in the cold and in the heat, and who find themselves, after long years of service, unable to further labor and yet without a competency. Where does their pension come from, Mr. Chairman? A great majority of these have a smaller yearly income than even the very lowest salary paid by the Government, and yet we are told that in order to protect Government employees from their own extravagance, and in order to protect the Government from imposition from incompetent servants, we must not only pay higher salaries, but we must take from their salaries a certain per cent for an insurance fund and set this great Government out on a career of life and annuity insurance; all of it the direct result, to my mind, of these organizations of employees. Let us look for a moment at this proposed civil pension. We are told that it will come from the salary of the employee and that the Government will simply hold it as trustee to pay it out in the terms of the law.

Who pays the salaries but the Government? Who furnishes the money but the people? Besides, Mr. Chairman, who will dare stand upon this floor and promise the people of the United States that these very employees will not soon again, through their organizations, urge upon Congress an increase of salaries? What will they say? They will say to Congress, "You paid us at one time so much salary. You said by law that we were entitled to it. You said it was necessary for our maintenance and support. You have now taken 3, 4, or 5 per cent of that salary and have by so much reduced our income. True, you have a retirement fund which theoretically belongs to us, but that does not supply present necessities. If we would enjoy that fund, we must live; if we would live, we must have our salaries." The pressure would come and then we would see the ridiculous spectacle of Congress dancing in response to the demands of organized politicians and hurrying to raise salaries by the same or on a larger percentage than the percentage of reduction by means of which the retirement fund was established.

The first step renders the second easy. The history of legisla-

tion in the United States bears me out in this assertion. In fact, all legislation the world over testifies to its truth. The fact that every branch of the postal service is now organized, standing at the door of Congress clamoring for increases of salaries under the guise of "reclassification," "equalization," and other harmless and innocent terms, warns us that the time has come to lay the hand of prohibition on such organizations. The history of the pension legislation of the United States is warning sufficient for reasonable men. One step at a time has increased the pension list from an estimated cost of thirty millions to one hundred and forty millions, and the end is not yet. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the entire history of the American people, the increase of offices, the increase of salaries in all of these offices, from the beginning until now, warns us to stop where we are. I have heard gentlemen speak eloquently of the employee who, having "grown gray" in the service of the Government, has been at last in his old age "turned out to graze."

This is a sentimental picture, Mr. Chairman, and I doubt not almost brings tears to the eyes of the would-be civil pensioner who sees or hears it. Let me give you a practical picture. Consider the fact as stated by me before in these remarks—and I defy contradiction—that every one of these employees bettered his financial condition when he entered the Government service and that every one would resign to-day and become a private citizen if by so doing he could better his present condition. If this be true, instead of commiserating with this "poor unfortunate class," we ought to congratulate them upon their great good fortune in having had the opportunity of entering the service of the Government. "Grown gray" in the service, have they? I see men all around me who have grown gray in the public service and who have fought for their lives every second year since entering political life. For their defeat and retirement to private life not a tear will fall from friend or foe. I see men around me in this House who in a few days will retire to private life unwept and unsung, but not, I hope, unhonored. And when it comes time for me, as it must come in the life of every man in public life, to drink of the bitter cup of defeat I must not only drink it amid the jeers and cheers of my opponents, but must take it with apparent relish.

Grown gray feeding at the public crib, the Government officials who are appointed to office must be protected from the people, who support them, their salaries fixed to suit them on demand, and at last pensioned by Congress. Ah, Mr. Chairman, rather than commiserate with the dancers, let us commiserate with the people who must pay the fiddlers. If a kind Providence and a beneficent Government have permitted them to "grow gray in the Government service," with salaries far greater than are paid for the same services in private life, they should thank God for the opportunity to lay up something for the evening of life, and be ready to stand aside with a competency for themselves, saved without compulsion, when, by reason of age, they have become incompetent. The Government employee is no less a man by reason of his employment.

Gentlemen say that incompetents can not be got rid of under the present system. If the civil service is to be continued, Mr. Chairman, why not let us fix an age limit and let it be inflexible. A better plan still has been suggested, I believe, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. Let there be a fixed tenure of office, beyond which no man, whether influential or not, shall be permitted to serve. There are thousands, yea, millions, of our fellow-countrymen who, although not in office, have "grown gray" in the service of their country on less than the smallest salary paid by the Government to its lowest employee. Every day, worn and weary with life's hard struggle, they lie down in their graves without ever having had the opportunity to lay up something with which to even decently put them away. Why should they be taxed that a special, petted class shall be built up, rendered secure of their offices while in health and cared for by the Government in their days of inefficiency? It is the unsalaried man, the man without office, the man without a pension, and without hope of one, the unorganized man, if you please, for whom I speak to-day. Instead of increasing his burden, I would lighten it, in order that, free and unfettered in life's race, he may have every opportunity to reach the highest ideal of citizenship. [Applause.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the following title:

H. R. 8814. An act to provide for the entry of lands formerly in Lower Brule Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution No. 70.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary

arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice-President of the United States on the 4th day of March, next.

With the following amendment:

In lines 8 and 9 strike out "and Vice-President."

INAUGURATION ARRANGEMENTS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the concurrent resolution H. C. Res. 70 with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, this will now be considered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced as the members of the joint committee on the part of the House the following: Mr. CANNON of Illinois, Mr. DALZELL of Pennsylvania and Mr. McRAE of Arkansas.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

[Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. HOPKINS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 31, 1901:

H. R. 4333. An act granting a pension to John Calvin Lane.

On February 1, 1901:

H. R. 428. An act to amend the law establishing a port of delivery at Des Moines, Iowa;

H. R. 4728. An act providing for leaves of absence to certain employees of the Government; and

H. R. 11785. An act to provide for the construction of a bridge by the Fargo, Duluth and Northwestern Railroad Company across the Red River of the North at Fargo, N. Dak.

On February 4, 1901:

H. R. 12281. An act to amend section 3255 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, concerning the distilling of brandy from fruits;

H. R. 4910. An act to establish a lobster hatchery in the State of Maine;

H. R. 533. An act to correct the military record of George J. Titcomb; and

H. R. 4020. An act for the relief of William Burke.

On February 5, 1901:

H. R. 9762. An act directing the issue of a duplicate of a lost check drawn by E. B. Atwood, lieutenant-colonel and deputy quartermaster-general, United States Army, in favor of Alfred C. Case.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of this bill there were three items reserved for the general debate: First, the pneumatic-tube service; second, the question of the pay for mail transportation by the railroads; and third, the special-facilities subsidy. I shall touch but briefly upon the first two of these, and devote a little more time and attention to the third.

The pneumatic-tube service, as the House is aware, has been largely an experimental service in three of the large cities of the country—Boston, Philadelphia, and New York. Perhaps I should say four large cities, because the New York service reaches to Brooklyn. Each year for a number of years past we have made an appropriation for the expedition of the mails by the pneumatic tube.

Year after year the question has come up in the Post-Office Committee whether the expedition of the mails through these tubes was at all commensurate with the expense of maintaining the service. The committee this year decided, and largely upon the report of the postal commission who investigated this subject, that the slight expedition, the slight saving of time, in the forwarding of mail through these tubes would not warrant the continued expenditure for that end, and therefore the committee has not recommended the appropriation.

In addition to that, other cities are demanding that this pneumatic-tube service be extended to them and that they should have the same facilities which have been extended to the cities I have named. The proposition was offered in the bill by the committee this year to provide for the extension of the tube service to the cities of Chicago and St. Louis. The committee also had been called upon to investigate the question of extending the tube service to other large cities of the country, and that committee make a report as to the probable expense of maintaining this tube service in other cities as well as those named.

Mr. Chairman, the committee was satisfied that the greatest expedition that could be obtained by the use of any of these pneumatic tubes in the cities where they are now introduced would not exceed from thirty to forty minutes, and for this service the Government was paying an exorbitant rate of rental for the use of the tubes. I presume that gentlemen here on the floor of the House, representing the cities where the tube service now exists, will make a determined effort to put that item back into the bill. But it is merely a fad. It is a very nice thing to have a letter put into the New York post-office and by compressed air be shot almost instantly to Brooklyn or to the great central railroad stations for transportation elsewhere. After all it is merely fad. It does not pay for the money we expend upon it. The results do not justify the expenditure, and, therefore, when this appeal is made by these gentlemen, I feel that it is very properly chargeable to local pride for the maintenance of this expedited service in those cities where it is already established without reference to the benefits to be derived by the country at large by the use of the pneumatic service.

Mr. Chairman, upon the second item I wish to be heard but briefly. That is the question of railway mail pay. In that connection I wish to say that it would be a piece of almost impertinence on my part to attempt to add anything to what has been already so ably stated by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], a member of the commission. I have read as carefully as might be the testimony taken before the commission, and I have reached the same conclusion that the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] have reached upon this point—that is to say, that this question ought to be considered by a commission and a report made to this House, and let action be taken after that has been received.

I would like to see this done upon an entirely different line from what the railway mail pay has heretofore proceeded upon, and that, instead of its being a compensation fixed almost entirely by weight, the mail pay ought to be fixed largely, if not entirely, upon the space devoted to carrying the mail, coupled with speed. Speed and space are the two elements that should be considered in fixing the rate. A railroad company, for instance, might give us all the space we needed, or more than we could occupy, but if its cars were not run at a good rate of speed, or if, on the other hand, they were run at an uncommonly low rate of speed, it would be of no practical value to us in the transportation of the mails.

Or, on the other hand, the company might give us a rapid train, but if we had not the proper space and proper facilities for handling the mail, it would answer no satisfactory purpose to the Government; but a combination of space and speed with the element, of course, of weight considered—at least to the extent of fixing a minimum weight which should go on a car—that would be a proper basis, I think, for fixing the railway mail pay. And upon that line the gentleman from Massachusetts has well said that action should be taken, and that in view of the experts who have been heard upon the question that would seem to be a proper basis on which to fix the terms of payment for this railway mail service.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me—

Mr. BROMWELL. In a moment. I should be willing that this matter might go on at the present rate until that was demonstrated by such a commission, or even, if necessary, that the railway mail pay should be carried on upon the same basis that contracts are now made—that is, for a period of four years—with the understanding that at the end of that time proper remedies should be applied.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman has said that "space and speed" are the elements to consider in making up the mail pay. Now, I would ask the gentleman why he takes into consideration the question of speed, when on the passenger trains of the country passenger rates are no higher on the fast trains than they are on the accommodation or slow trains?

Mr. BROMWELL. I will answer the gentleman as best I can. In the first place, I do not think his premises are correct.

Mr. GAINES. Why, it is precisely the same thing. If you go 50 miles on a railroad, whether you go on a fast train or a slow one, you pay the same rate.

Mr. BROMWELL. But the gentleman must admit, of course, that it costs a great deal more to run a train a mile a minute than to run a train 30 miles an hour.

Mr. GAINES. Undoubtedly. But the gentleman knows and I know that there is a fast train running from here to Cincinnati on the Louisville and Nashville road. Now, the fare on that train is precisely the same when I go through there to Nashville as it is on the slow train.

Mr. BROMWELL. But the question of cost to the railroad company necessarily enters into the question.

Mr. THROPP. I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether in the case he cites the railroad company is making as much as it formerly did?

Mr. GAINES. I do not know as to that. They are making the same charge for everybody. All must pay this same rate.

Mr. BROMWELL. Well, I think it is understood, and the gentleman from Tennessee understands it as well as anybody, that the faster you run a train the more expensive it is to the railroad company.

Mr. GAINES. Then why should they not charge more for carrying passengers on fast trains?

Mr. BROMWELL. Take, for instance, the Burlington train going out of Chicago. There was an interview published with the fireman of that train in a paper, in which the statement was made that a ton of coal is burned every twenty minutes on that train.

Mr. GAINES. But the rate from Chicago to Nashville is cheaper than it ever was before.

Mr. BROMWELL. That may be true, because other economies permit it.

Mr. GAINES. Then why should not the same thing apply to the carrying of the mails?

Mr. BROMWELL. I say the three elements that ought to be considered in fixing railway mail pay here should be space, which is of most importance; second, the rate of speed, which is one of the elements that the Post-Office Department must necessarily compel the railroad companies to give; and, third, a minimum rate of weight; so that while the railroad company is giving ample space it shall not give more space than is needed and, in other words, compel the Government, by giving space and speed, to give them a greater rate of railway mail pay than under the one based upon weight alone.

Now, as I suggested, I have nothing to add to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] has said upon this. He has given it an exhaustive study, and probably no man in this House, unless it be the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], is so well prepared to reach conclusions on this subject, and so I leave it at that, and pass to the third of these items which are set aside.

Mr. Chairman, if the members of this House will take the reports of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General for the last seven or eight years past, they will find a uniform statement year after year in regard to the special facilities for fast mail. In this year's report, on page 16, they will find the following language, and it is exactly the same in the reports of previous years:

[Second Assistant's report, page 16, "special facilities."]

In submitting the estimates for several years past this office has declined to include the item of "special facilities" for reasons heretofore stated, but notwithstanding appropriations have been made.

The annual rate of expenditure for the service on June 30, 1900, was \$195,722.50, and this sum was expended as shown in the following statement:

No. of route.	Termini.	Railroad company.	Miles.	Pay per annum.
109004	New York, N. Y., to Philadelphia, Pa.	Pennsylvania	90.65	\$11,331.25
113001	Philadelphia, Pa., to Washington, D. C.	Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore	137.43	17,178.75
114002	Washington, D. C., to Danville Junction, Va.	Southern	238.20	29,775.00
118013	Danville Junction, Va., to Atlanta, Ga.	do	409.40	51,175.00
121003	Atlanta to Westpoint, Ga.	Atlanta and Westpoint	86.20	10,705.00
124001	Westpoint, Ga., to Montgomery, Ala.	Western Railway of Alabama	85.63	10,703.75
124012	Montgomery, Ala., to New Orleans, La.	Louisville and Nashville	318.27	39,783.75
155010	Kansas City to Newton, Kans.	Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe	201.2	25,000.00
Total				195,722.50

All of the items in this table, except the last one, are a subsidy given to a system of roads commencing at New York City and running to New Orleans, the last item being a subsidy to the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe line from Kansas City to Newton, Kans., about 201 miles. The Assistant Postmaster-General then adds:

The appropriation for the current fiscal year is \$196,238.75. No estimate is submitted for the next fiscal year.

That has been, year after year, the report of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General. He has refused to make any recommendation for this special fast mail subsidy; and yet year after year the subsidy is made, and the subsidy is paid to these roads. In the hearing before the Postal Commission the question was asked by Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts, of Mr. Shallenberger, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General—

Is not the matter discretionary with the Department even after Congress makes the appropriation?

And Mr. Shallenberger answered:

Well, the Department would have the power to withhold it; but having recommended to Congress the advisability of withholding it, the Department is bound to assume that Congress desires the appropriation to be used, so long as it is made.

I want to say that every member of the postal commission with the exception of three, Mr. CHANDLER not joining in the report, with the exception of Senator MARTIN and Mr. CATCHINGS, reported adversely to the continuance of this subsidy. And even Mr. CATCHINGS, of the House, and Senator MARTIN, of Virginia, have stated no reasons in their report further than the one I have just called attention to, that it was discretionary with the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and therefore, as he exercised the discretion, it must imply that he thought it ought to be made. This is what Mr. CATCHINGS says in his report:

I concur in the foregoing report of Mr. MOODY, with the exception of so much thereof as might be held to refer to "special facilities appropriations." These appropriations have not been made mandatory, but subject to the discretion of the Postmaster-General. No doubt he would discontinue the expenditure if the service now enjoyed by the communities in question could be secured without it. I can not unite in the recommendation that these appropriations be discontinued.

T. C. CATCHINGS.

Now, Senator MARTIN, who also filed a minority report on that subject, used almost identically, and I do not know but what it is identically the same language, giving only the one reason, that in the language of the bill the expenditure was entirely optional with the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and as he exercised the option and expended the money, therefore the appropriation ought to be continued. Now, we have answered that by the reply of General Shallenberger made to the commission:

"That although the language of this appropriation might be directory and not mandatory," yet for years and years the Second Assistant Postmaster-General comes in with his report to this House and says that he will not recommend, for the reasons given in the past, the continuation of this appropriation, and for years and years the effort is made on the floor of this House to have that stricken out of the bill, and the House votes it in, how can the Postmaster-General act otherwise than he does, which is to yield to his own good judgment and discretion to what he might well consider an order of Congress upon the subject.

Now, in the report of another member of this commission [Mr. FLEMING] on page 30, is given a valuable résumé of the history of this subject of fast mail appropriations. I will ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

The first act granting the facilities, or subsidies, was approved March 3, 1877. This act appropriated \$150,000, but I have not been able to ascertain on what routes the money was expended.

The act of June 17, 1877, appropriated \$125,000. The act of March 3, 1879, appropriated \$150,000. The act of June 11, 1880, appropriated \$350,000. The act of March 1, 1881, appropriated \$425,000. Of this latter sum the Department saw fit to expend only \$374,530.64. This expenditure was distributed over 26 different postal routes and divided up among 14 different lines of railway running in various directions from New York City north to Springfield and Buffalo; west to Philadelphia, Chicago, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and St. Louis, and south to Washington, Richmond, Charleston, Savannah, St. Augustine, Charlotte, Atlanta, New Orleans, and so on.

By the act of May 4, 1882, Congress appropriated \$500,000 for special facilities. Out of this sum the Department found it necessary to expend only \$185,121.32. This expenditure embraced only 11 postal routes and was distributed among only 9 railroads. With some minor changes, this condition existed until June 30, 1893. From July 1, 1893, to June 30, 1897, the expenditures for special facilities amounted to \$171,238.75 per annum, the number of routes embraced in these expenditures being only 9 and the railroads among which the amount was distributed being only 6, and these routes and railroads being all included in the single general mail line from New York to New Orleans. The act of 1897, in addition to the line from New York to New Orleans, embraced service between Kansas City, Mo., and Newton, Kans., a distance of 201.02 miles, for which an additional sum of \$25,000 was appropriated, and the total appropriation for 1897 was \$195,722.50. This latter sum has been continued up to the present time.

It will thus be seen that the number of mail routes enjoying this subsidy was reduced from 26 in 1882 down to 9 in 1893, with the addition of 2 more routes in 1897 between Kansas City and Newton. The number of railroads drawing this extra pay has been reduced from 14 in 1882 down to 6 in 1893, and this number was increased by 1 additional road in 1897.

It is difficult to justify the expenditure of this money over this one particular route between New York and New Orleans, to say nothing of the little 200-mile route from Kansas City to Newton, when no such extra pay is being given to any other route, not even to those roads whose trains run across the sparsely settled country and over the mountains between the Mississippi Valley and the Pacific Ocean.

It should furthermore be stated that the Post-Office Department long ago recommended to Congress the advisability of withholding the special appropriation. Postmaster-General Wanamaker, in his report under date of November 30, 1891, declined to include in his budget for the following year any estimate for special facilities, the reason given being that such appropriations were not necessary and created dissatisfaction on the part of other roads not receiving the benefits. In a letter addressed to the chairman of the House Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, under date of February 25, 1892, Postmaster-General Wanamaker further stated "the continuance of the special-facility allowance has for some years past been a source of much annoyance to the Department, and has hampered the best interests of the mail service, because railroads operating in contiguous territory, and to some extent paralleling the roads which receive the extra pay, object to rendering equally good or quicker schedule mail service except they be paid corresponding rates."

Since that time no Postmaster-General has asked Congress for an appropriation for special mail facilities. But Congress has forced the appropriation upon the Department in spite of its own protest. It is true the act now provides that the Postmaster-General shall not expend the money unless he deems the expenditure necessary to promote the interests of the postal service, but inasmuch as the act also specifies the particular lines of road to receive the money, and inasmuch as the Department has recommended Congress to withhold the appropriation and Congress insists upon making it, it is not strange that the Department should conclude that Congress desires the appropriation to be expended as long as it is made. There are no doubt

many other routes in the country whose general conditions and surroundings would give them an equal justification for extra pay.
I can see no sufficient reason for continuing the discrimination nor for making the unnecessary expenditure.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Chairman, there need be nothing inconsistent in the position of members of this House reversing the vote which they took upon this subject a year ago. At that time the report of the Postal Commission had not been completed; it was not in the hands of the members of this House; and therefore the reasons which ought to appeal now to the judgment and the intelligence of the members of this House perhaps did not exist in as forcible a manner as they do now. I want to call attention of the House to this. I suppose you all have copies of these hearings. In the hearing, commencing on page 447 and running through successive pages of the report, is the examination of General Shallenberger by the Postal Commission. In the course of that examination he submits a report from Mr. Grant, which is particularly strong in showing that neither one of these two subsidies are accomplishing for the Government any of the good results in the way of expedition of the mails claimed for them. Now, I shall read just hurriedly here a few extracts.

Mr. LOUD said in his question to the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, referring to the subsidy on the line from Kansas City to Newton, Kans.:

Do you believe that the Government receives greater returns from the expenditure of the money upon this road than it would receive had it been devoted to any other road in the United States?

A. I do not believe that it receives any greater return from expenditures on this road than it would on any other in the country.

Mr. LOUD. Do you believe that it receives as great advantages as it would have received from some others?

A. I am not prepared at this moment positively to say so, but my impression is that there are roads in the country over which greater returns would be received.

Mr. LOUD. A great amount of mail could have been expedited, and the mail expedited to a greater extent than it has been on this road?

A. Yes.

On page 448 of these hearings—volume 1 it is that I am quoting from—the statement was filed by Mr. Shallenberger with the commission, made by Mr. Alexander Grant, Acting General Superintendent of the Railway Mail Service at the time. Without going through all of that statement, I will read some extracts. I hope the House will read it all. It says:

There seems to be no justification for the special facilities payments, judging from results obtained. If we treated all lines on this basis, then we should pay the Northwestern Railroad for running an early morning train from Chicago (at 2.45 a. m.) to Fort Howard, Wis.; also for Cedar Rapids from Chicago. We should also pay the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad for a train leaving Chicago at the same hour, and running to Marion and the West; also the same road for a train from Chicago to Milwaukee and St. Paul; the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy for a train leaving Chicago at 3 a. m. and running to Burlington and Omaha; the Monon Route for a train leaving Chicago in the early morning for Cincinnati.

Mr. GAINES. Will my friend read what is said there about the Louisville and Nashville, an unsubsidized railroad? He substantially says that it is not necessary.

Mr. BROMWELL. Well, I do not know just what the gentleman refers to; but here is one paragraph about the Louisville and Nashville, and possibly that is what the gentleman refers to:

As an evidence that special-facilities money is not necessary to enable railroads in the South to operate fast trains, I would cite the fact that the Louisville and Nashville Railroad maintains two through trains daily between Cincinnati and New Orleans, in addition to trains for local service. These through trains make a speed of 33 and 28 miles an hour, respectively, including stops.

Mr. GAINES. That is what I have in mind.

Mr. BROMWELL. I will ask to insert the entire statement in the RECORD. He makes a similar statement with reference to the special-facilities subsidy to the train running out of Kansas City, on page 458 of the report, and to the same effect.

I presume that, just as last year, gentlemen in favor of this subsidy, possibly the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], who made the statement last year, will read to this House a letter from General Shallenberger, which he will ask the House to construe as favoring this subsidy.

I want to call the attention of the House in advance to the fact that that letter was written on the 3d of March, 1898. You will find it in the RECORD of last year, while the hearing of General Shallenberger before the commission was nine months afterwards, or on the 1st of December, I think it was, 1898. So that if we are to place any reliance at all on the statement of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General we ought to construe it as we construe a man's will—by his last utterance, when he had more wisdom and experience than at first. I merely call attention to the two dates, and if credence is to be given where the two statements seem to conflict it ought to be given to the later utterance rather than the earlier.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman will pardon me, I would like to ask him if General Shallenberger had before him the Grant data when he wrote the letter?

Mr. BROMWELL. I am not advised as to that; I presume he did. At any rate, the two Grant letters received the indorsement of General Shallenberger, who says, in reply to questions, that he

himself is not so well informed as Mr. Grant, and therefore he substitutes Mr. Grant's statement and indorses it as correct.

Now, the gentleman will also stand up and plead eloquently for the subsidy on the ground that the South needs it, that it is a sparsely settled country, that it needs the special-facility trains from New York to the Southwest. The original history of this subsidy has been repeated in this House many times. It was originally a subsidy started in Massachusetts, going down by the way of New York City, through Philadelphia and Washington, and down the coast to Tampa, for the purpose of expediting the mails to Cuba and the West Indies. In 1893 that was switched from a fast mail to Cuba into a fast mail to New Orleans, and the subsidy has been given to these various lines since that time, with the exception that \$25,000 was taken off from a part between Worcester or Springfield, Mass., and New York, which was discontinued.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman will allow me a suggestion, I asked him about the Grant letter. I find General Shallenberger indorses it and says in this report, page 451:

I would say that this paper, having been prepared by Mr. Grant from official data, is, of course, official, authoritative, and would be preferred to any statement I can make from memory.

Mr. BROMWELL. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for the suggestion. Now, the gentleman from Virginia will say to us, as he has said in the past, that without this appropriation this system of fast mail train will be abolished. He will state the fact that before 1893 there were trains running between New York and New Orleans that did not make as good time as this fast mail does to-day. I want to call the attention of gentlemen of the House to the very letter he will produce from General Shallenberger—if he produces it at all, and if he does not you will find it printed in the RECORD of last year—giving the time-tables of the trains in 1893 between New York, Tampa, and New Orleans, and the time-tables of the subsidized trains now in existence on that road.

I have taken the trouble to compare the time made by the unsubsidized trains of this system in 1893 with the subsidized trains of 1899 and 1900. The unsubsidized train of 1893 is the one that was No. 35 over this same line of route from New York by the way of the Pennsylvania road practically to Washington, over the Southern road and the Louisville and Nashville; that was train 35 unsubsidized, and in that letter he gives the running time of that train to the different points along this line. I will print this table in the RECORD, but I want to call the attention of the House to it as showing that the alleged difference in favor of the subsidized train is not borne out.

Now, to compare that with train 35—the same number—which left at a different hour, which is the subsidized train south.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman will pardon me, my recollection is that train 35 was put on a short time before the subsidy was granted, at the request of the Postmaster-General, for the purpose of making an experiment.

Mr. BROMWELL. This train 35 did not run at the same hour as the present train, and I am informed by the gentleman from California that the train had been in existence some time previously.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I think it had not.

The table referred to by Mr. BROMWELL is as follows:

New York to—	1893, No. 35, unsubsidized.		1898, No. 35, subsidized.		Difference.
	<i>h.</i>	<i>m.</i>	<i>h.</i>	<i>m.</i>	
Washington	6	13	6	45	+0 32
Danville	13	0	13	25	+0 25
Greensboro	14	25	15	02	+0 37
Charlotte	16	55	17	30	+0 35
Atlanta	24	25	23	40	-0 45
Montgomery	28	20	28	20
Mobile	34	45	35	15	+0 30
New Orleans	39	05	39	40	+0 35
Houston	55	37	52	25	-3 12
San Antonio	63	30	59	55	-3 35

Mr. BROMWELL. Train 35, unsubsidized, from New York to Washington, was six hours and thirteen minutes; subsidized, six hours and forty-five minutes, or thirty-two minutes longer in reaching Washington than the unsubsidized train. New York to Danville, unsubsidized, thirteen hours; subsidized, thirteen hours and twenty-five minutes, or twenty-five minutes longer. From New York to Greensboro fourteen hours and twenty-five minutes unsubsidized, and fifteen hours and two minutes subsidized, or thirty-seven minutes longer.

Without going into the whole of this table I will give you the results: From New York to Washington the subsidized takes thirty-two minutes longer than the unsubsidized; to Danville, twenty-five minutes longer; to Greensboro, thirty-seven minutes longer; to Charlotte, thirty-five minutes longer; to Montgomery, the same time; to Atlanta, forty-five minutes shorter; to Mobile, thirty minutes longer; to New Orleans, thirty-five minutes longer.

Now, west of New Orleans, when Texas points are reached, there is an actual saving of time, probably due to the connections that it makes. It gets to Houston in three hours and twelve minutes less time; to San Antonio in three hours and thirty-five minutes less. But if we are going to give this subsidy it ought to be given to the Texas road, which is not in this system at all, as that is the line that makes the connection with this fast mail, so called.

Mr. BURKE of Texas. The Texas roads do not want any subsidy.

Mr. BROMWELL. I do not suppose they do. I do not know of any other roads in the country that do.

Mr. SIMS. As I understand the gentleman, the unsubsidized roads carried the mail just as well as is done under this subsidy?

Mr. BROMWELL. They carried the mails just as well for the regular pay, without any subsidy.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman allow me to read a few lines from the report of this railroad mail commission, report 1? I read from the testimony of General Shallenberger, on page 454 of volume 1:

Q. Do you mean to say that prior to the subsidy system these trains over the Southern road outstripped the trains over all other roads to such an extent as to secure from them the freight and passenger business?

A. No; I think these trains have been developed since the period when the subsidy became available.

Mr. LOUD. Which is the subsidized train?

Mr. CATCHINGS. I do not think it matters; I am willing for you to put in any other you please.

Mr. LOUD. I make the statement that the trains made the same time before the subsidy was granted that they do now.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I will ask you that question, Did the unsubsidized trains make as fast time before the subsidy was granted to the Southern road as they do now?

Mr. LOUD. I assert that they made the same time in December, 1892, that they make to-day.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Well, I am asking for information.

Mr. LOUD. And by reason of that fact they secured the passenger traffic; and they made that time to make connection with the Southern Pacific which goes to the West, leaving two hours after this train arrives in the morning at New Orleans.

Here, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] is asking for "information" of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD] and got this reply, and yet he favors this subsidy.

Mr. BROMWELL. Now, I want to call attention to another

point. To hear this annual controversy upon the special fast-mail subsidy one would imagine that this subsidy was all the compensation that these roads obtained for carrying the mail; that the whole question was whether they were to get anything at all for carrying the mail over this route. As a matter of fact, these roads are liberally paid for carrying the mails, without reference to this subsidy. I have here a table which I will insert in the RECORD. I will refer only to an item or two, to show what these railroads get in addition to the subsidy. The aggregate runs up to \$1,720,446.97.

The Pennsylvania line, on this part of its line—not the whole Pennsylvania system, but the part running from New York down to Philadelphia—gets \$394,651; from Philadelphia to Baltimore, \$307,837. Then the Southern road comes in with its two branches, on the first of which it gets \$318,506, and on the second \$404,230, making nearly \$723,000. The Atlanta and West Point road gets \$55,000, the Western Railroad of Alabama over \$53,000, the Louisville and Nashville \$186,000.

The compensation received by these roads make altogether more than a million and a quarter of dollars, including, of course, this subsidy.

Mr. GAINES. Including how many roads?

Mr. BROMWELL. Some six roads altogether—the Pennsylvania; the Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore, which is practically the Pennsylvania; the Southern; the Atlanta and West Point; the Western Railroad of Alabama, and the Louisville and Nashville.

Now, let me call attention to another fact. The whole State of New York, with all its railroad system, including every railroad in the State through which the railway mail pay is distributed, has a mileage six times as great as this continuous line from New York to New Orleans; yet those railroads in the State of New York get only one and one-half times as much mail pay. In other words, taking the proportion of mileage on these two systems, the roads on this subsidized line get four times as much on the average as the New York lines.

The railroads in the State of Pennsylvania, aggregating five times the length of this system, get \$30,000 less a year of mail pay. The roads in the State of Illinois, with nearly eight times as much mileage on which the mails are carried, get only one and one-fourth times as much pay as is given to this system.

No. of route.	Distance.	Ordinary annual pay for transportation.	Payment for postal cars.	Subsidy.	Total.	Name of railroad.
	Miles.					
109004	90.65	\$310,255.97	\$73,064.75	\$11,331.25	\$394,651.97	Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore).
113001	137.43	252,865.70	37,793.25	17,173.75	307,837.70	Southern.
114002	238.20	231,563.74	57,168.00	29,775.00	318,506.74	Do.
118013	409.40	291,230.78	61,825.00	51,175.00	404,230.78	Atlanta and Westpoint.
121003	86.29	35,990.29	8,620.00	10,775.00	55,385.29	Western Railway of Alabama.
124001	85.72	34,446.53	8,563.00	10,703.75	53,713.33	Louisville and Nashville.
124012	318.27	114,570.41	31,827.00	39,783.75	186,181.16	
Total.....					1,720,446.97	

Total length of subsidized lines.....	miles.....	1,365.78
Average subsidy per mile.....		\$125.00
Total compensation.....		\$1,720,446.97
Average compensation per mile, about.....		\$1,260.00

New York, with a mileage six times as great, gets only one and one-half times as much pay.

Pennsylvania, with a mileage over five times as great, gets \$30,000 less per year.

Illinois, with a mileage nearly eight times as great, gets only one and one-fourth times as much.

But gentlemen say we need to give the subsidy in order to expedite the mails and get rapid service. I have alluded to the fact that the service before this subsidy was granted was fully as good as now and that, in fact, the unsubsidized train went at a more rapid rate than the subsidized train does to-day. Now, let us compare the speed on this subsidized train with the speed on some of the other great railroads of the country.

This 3.35 subsidized train from Washington to Charlotte, 380 miles, makes an average rate of speed of 36 miles an hour. Why, sir, the Chesapeake and Ohio or the Baltimore and Ohio, crossing the mountains, plowing their way through tunnels, with curves and heavy grades—with which there is nothing to compare on the line of the Southern road—makes between Cincinnati and Washington a rate of speed fully equal to that.

From Washington to Atlanta the average is only 34.7 miles an hour. That is not rapid railroad traveling. From Washington to New Orleans, a distance of something less than 1,360 miles, the average rate of speed is only 35 miles an hour. Compare this with the speed on some of the other great railroads of the country. The Illinois Central, on train No. 3, from Chicago to Cairo, 365 miles, makes a speed of 37.4 miles an hour. The same road from Chicago to Memphis, 527 miles, makes an average of 34.2 miles an hour. The same road between Chicago and New Orleans, 923

miles, makes an average of 35 miles an hour. The Santa Fe road from Chicago to Kansas City, train No. 17, makes for 458 miles an average rate of 40 miles an hour.

On the Burlington road, from Chicago to Kansas City, a distance of 500 miles, the average rate is 36 miles per hour. On the Baltimore and Ohio road, the S. and W., from Parkersburg to St. Louis, a distance of 577 miles, the average speed is 34 miles an hour. The Big Four Railroad, from Cleveland to St. Louis, a distance of 548 miles, makes an average of 36 miles an hour, and I am told that the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy for the first 83 miles out from Chicago runs nearly a mile a minute, or makes the 83 miles in eighty-five minutes.

Now, Mr. Chairman, taking the Empire Express on the New York Central, or any of the great trunk lines or systems that carry the mails, you will find that 35 or 40 miles an hour is not considered an excessive rate of speed, and yet special Southern trains that get this subsidy, in addition to the regular pay—because they receive that also—make the rate much less than the average of any of these other roads. Where, then, is the justification for the subsidy?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman please explain why this road to which he refers makes only 35 miles an hour, while other roads make 40 and 45?

Mr. BROMWELL. There may be merely physical reasons—
Mr. LIVINGSTON. I hope the gentleman will explain the reasons, if any exist.

Mr. BROMWELL. I was going on to say that there may be physical reasons in some cases. But I do not believe that there is any physical reason here, on any part of the line of this subsidized road, that would not be true in a greater degree, as far as the difficulty of making this speed is concerned, on any other road crossing the mountains from the East to the West, either the Appalachian system or the Rocky Mountains.

Take, for instance, the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. This road runs across bridges, through tunnels, over viaducts, and has heavy grades, while the subsidized road, excepting a small part of it in the State of Virginia, is comparatively an easy grade. The grades on the Baltimore and Ohio are in some cases very heavy.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. How about that part of the road east of us?

Mr. BROMWELL. Take, for instance, the road from New York to Washington. There are no heavy grades there. Why give a subsidy on that part of the line? The gentleman does not answer. He is not interested in that part of it.

Mr. SIMS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio what is the difference in time between the subsidized trains and the other trains running over this same road which are not subsidized? What increase of speed has been made by the subsidized train, and what expedition does this train get by reason of the subsidy?

Mr. BROMWELL. The Postmaster-General, in answer to that inquiry, said—and I have no doubt that this matter will be discussed fully by gentlemen who favor the subsidy—that it was really a detriment to the Post-Office Department that this subsidy should be continued. He said that if it were taken from this road he could get a portion of the mail which now goes over it carried on other roads; or, in other words, that he could secure competitive bidding.

Mr. GAINES. So as to let these other lines bid for the mail?

Mr. BROMWELL. Yes; but the other roads can not come in because of this subsidy. They are placed at a disadvantage.

Mr. SIMS. Has this subsidy had any effect—that is the point I want to get at—upon the running of trains? In other words, are there other trains on the road as fast or faster than this train to which the subsidy goes?

Mr. BROMWELL. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state that I made an exhaustive research last year on that subject, which is embodied in the report and embodied in the RECORD; and if gentlemen choose to look into it, they will find complete statements as to the trains run by this road in comparison to this subsidized train. Instead of the subsidized train being the fastest, they will find that there are a number of other trains that make better time.

Mr. SIMS. That is just the point I wanted to find out.

Mr. BROMWELL. And so far as the subsidy has tended to expedite the trains, it seems to have had just the opposite effect.

Mr. SIMS. Have they so changed the schedule as to make it extra expensive to run this train?

Mr. BROMWELL. I do not so understand it. I do understand from the statement of the Assistant Postmaster-General that they would have to run this train, whether they got the subsidy or not, by reason of their passenger, freight, and express business.

Now, I know that the Postmaster-General will be quoted, and his assistant will be quoted, in reference to this matter by gentlemen favoring the subsidy. We will be told that there is a faster service than there was in 1893. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is very natural. Of course there is. And so also with reference to every other road in the country since then. All of these roads have been changing their equipments, their motive power, have put down heavier rails and generally improved their train service so that a rate that would have made our hair stand on end ten years ago—say the rate of 35 miles an hour—would be insignificant in comparison to these trains which travel from 50 to 60 miles an hour.

Why? Not because it gets a subsidy to help it make speed, but because of the improvements in the road itself. Ten years ago a large part of this line—that is, the Southern road—was in the hands of a receiver. It was a bankrupt road; but it has since been well managed. It was taken out of the hands of the receiver, its roadbed was improved, its grades were probably cut down, possibly some of the curves were taken out, heavier rails were put on, better motive power, better cars, better men to handle the trains, and the result is that they do have an improved service over what it was ten years ago, but not due to any subsidy.

Mr. GAINES. They have the air-brake appliances now.

Mr. BROMWELL. And air brakes, of course, that save many an hour on a long journey in the stoppage and starting of trains.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I may want to answer some of the re-

marks made on the other side of this question, and therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMS. I should like to ask the gentleman one question and that is this: Have these different railroads sent representatives before the committee to ask this, or how does it come that it is put into the bill? Do the railroad companies themselves ask for it, or how does it get into the bill?

Mr. BROMWELL. So far as I know of my personal knowledge, no representative of a railroad has ever appeared before our Post-Office Committee, but the committee recognize that year after year, although after an effort we have had it thrown out of the bill once or twice, yet when it comes into the House it finds advocates and earnest defenders here on the floor in many gentlemen who represent the districts and States through which this system runs, and who feel it incumbent upon them to support this appropriation, as though it was a benefit to the people of their districts, while as a matter of fact it is a benefit to nobody except this line of railroad.

Mr. GAINES. The House threw it out in the Fifty-fifth Congress and the Senate put it back.

Mr. BROMWELL. Yes.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I will say in response to the gentleman from Tennessee that so far as the subsidy from Kansas City to Newton is concerned the railroad protests against it and does not wish it.

Mr. SIMS. I was referring to the other.

Mr. COWHERD. I am glad the gentleman from Massachusetts has made that statement, because I have stated it before the House heretofore, and it has been denied and laughed at.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Before our commission they stated that they did not desire it. It is a subsidy to the Kansas City newspapers.

Mr. BROMWELL. Then I suppose the gentleman from Kansas City [Mr. COWHERD] will join in asking that this subsidy be dispensed with?

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I never represented a railroad company in asking for that subsidy. I always represented the people who were served, and when I have stated heretofore on the floor of this House that the railroad company do not want the subsidy, and protest against performing the service even with the subsidy, gentlemen have laughed at my statement as ridiculous. I am glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody] has borne me out in that statement.

Mr. SIMS. The demand does not seem to come from the railroad companies, then, so far as this Southern subsidy is concerned.

Mr. BROMWELL. I know nothing about that at all.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will permit me, I do know something about that. The Southern Railroad did submit to the postal commission a very long communication in support of this special-facility appropriation.

Mr. BROMWELL. I will say that on page 656, Volume I, of the hearings before the postal commission you will find the testimony given by the president of the Southern Railway Company on this subject. I think he is the only railway official who was examined on the subject.

Mr. GAINES. If the gentleman will allow me, I should like to ask one other question. Have any "people"—a great multitude, a half a dozen, or even one—come before the Post-Office Committee asking for this subsidy?

Mr. BROMWELL. We have never had anybody appear before the committee to advocate it.

Mr. GAINES. Then it is in here and nobody wants it—neither the "people" nor railroads.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want the gentleman to answer a question, for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES] seems to be remarkably ignorant about who wants this subsidy. I want to ask the gentleman from Cincinnati [Mr. BROMWELL] if he is not aware of the fact that the municipal authorities of Nashville and of Chattanooga and of Knoxville and of Columbus—

Mr. GAINES. And the legislature of Tennessee.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And the legislature of Tennessee and the city of New Orleans and the city of Atlanta and the city of Charleston and the city of Savannah and the city of Mobile have all asked for this?

Mr. GAINES. And they have not one of them had the facts before them, I dare say, on which to form an opinion, which we have before us here for the first time.

Mr. BROMWELL. I will answer the question of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. As a man who has lived to the age that he has, he must know that you can get any resolution, indorsing any project on earth, passed by any body of men if you have got the right kind of men to take hold of it and present it; and I venture to say that you can get the members of this House to sign, without ever looking at it, a petition to hang the gentleman [laughter], and I mean no disrespect at all to the gentleman. I might have substituted myself. When the gentleman says that

the legislature of Tennessee and the city councils of these various other cities and boards of trade, etc., have indorsed these things, that is common experience.

We can get any proposition on earth indorsed by any chamber of commerce or city council or legislature, if we go at it in the right way; and, as the gentleman from Tennessee has said, with all due respect to the gentleman and with all due respect to the other gentlemen who represent the State of Tennessee here, who are as competent as any men on earth, and with all due respect to the gentlemen who form the boards of trade and the city councils of these various cities, I venture to say that they do not know as much as the snap of your finger about the whole subject, and, therefore, somebody interested in this particular matter was able to get their unanimous indorsement probably; and the more unanimous it was the less they knew about the whole subject. I understand the gentleman from Tennessee wants to add something.

Mr. GAINES. I want to say in reference to these resolutions from Knoxville, Tenn., and the legislature of Tennessee, that they do not show or state the facts upon which they are based, and I do not believe they had the facts before them when they were passed, for we know that for the first time all the facts are brought out in this House to-day, and not until to-day.

They have never been fully developed in this House or Senate. We have all the proof here to-day. The hearings were not accessible or published, or both, last session, and the report on this bill was not filed until a few days ago. Had these hearings and this report been before them, I do not believe these resolutions would have been passed. We have struggled to get to the facts and truth of the situation set out in this voluminous report, and have done so to-day. You see and hear the facts are new, and old errors pointed out we must here correct.

And, sirs, while this subsidy is in part to railroads that run through my State, with these facts only in part before me, on former occasions I have uniformly voted against it, and I believe the people of my State and the legislature of my State, which is an intelligent and honorable body, if they had the same facts before them as we have before us would do the same thing; and in saying that I think that I respect and reflect their will and wisdom.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Will the gentleman answer a question? Do you know what facts the legislature had before them?

Mr. GAINES. I do not think the Tennessee legislature had any special knowledge on the subject.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do not want to know what you think; do you know what facts they had?

Mr. GAINES. I do not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen will be in order.

Mr. GAINES. I know they did not have the books that have been opened here for the first time to-day, nor the private information I have, showing this subsidy is not needed, given me by General Shallenberger.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. You do not know.

Mr. GAINES. I know they did not have it, on general principles—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. It is not what you know on general principles.

Mr. GAINES (continuing). Because they have not been in general circulation, and each member has only one copy.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I request the privilege of extending my remarks in the RECORD, as I have several tables I wish to insert.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman will have leave to extend his remarks.

Mr. BROMWELL. I desire to make the same request.

Mr. HENRY C. SMITH. I desire to make the same request.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, these several requests will be granted.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, while I am sure I will not agree with the remarks to be submitted by the gentleman from Mississippi, I take pleasure in yielding him twenty minutes of my time, reserving the remainder.

[Mr. CATCHINGS addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Tennessee to reserve the remainder of his time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. FLETCHER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 2991. An act confirming two locations of Chippewa half-breed scrip in the State (then Territory) of Utah.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment a bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 13491. An act authorizing the Mount Carmel Development Company to draw water from Wabash River at Grand Rapids, Wabash County, Ill.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore had, in compliance with the concurrent resolution of the Senate No. 87, appointed as tellers on the part of the Senate to count the electoral votes for President and Vice-President of the United States, in the Hall of the House of Representatives, Wednesday, the 13th day of February, 1901, Mr. CHANDLER and Mr. CAFFEY.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore of the Senate had, in compliance with House concurrent resolution No. 70, appointed Mr. HANNA, Mr. SPOONER, and Mr. JONES of Arkansas as the committee on the part of the Senate to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect on the 4th day of March next.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take up any time of the committee with any remarks at this time. I would like to have the privilege of printing in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, some days ago when the postal codification bill was under consideration sundry amendments were offered with a view of remedying some of the evils of the system of unlimited competition in the letting of star-route contracts. None of these amendments was adopted by the committee, not, in my opinion, because a majority of the members voting were not favorable to the objects sought to be accomplished by the amendments, but by reason of a general disposition on the part of the members to uphold the committee in its efforts to prevent the ingrafting of new legislation on a codification measure, the effect of which might be to jeopardize a much-needed codification of the postal laws, and a feeling that the Department, by its order of February 13, 1900, inaugurated a reform in star-route letting and there was no immediate necessity for legislation. The debate, however, served a good purpose in that it brought out some of the evils of unlimited competition in this branch of the public service.

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that a member of this House is constrained or justified in criticising a too parsimonious conduct of the public business; and while I am not well enough informed on the subject to speak with authority, I apprehend there is no other branch of the postal service in the administration of which there need be any criticism of undue parsimony, though there is a vague impression in the minds of many amounting almost to a conviction that in many branches of the service Congress has authorized expenditures which may be characterized as extremely liberal, if not wastefully extravagant. Let us examine for a moment the facts as to the compensation paid for the carrying of the star routes of these United States, aggregating 22,834 in number and extending over 269,857 miles—and I here digress to call attention to the fact that star routes are not matters of purely local interest, but matters of general interest to all of our people and to all sections of the country.

As was well said on the floor of the House a few days ago by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] in answer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], "the postal service must be treated as a whole," and these star routes, while they carry some local mail, carry a vastly greater proportion of mail of the various classes which originate in the commercial and literary centers of the country, as well as outgoing mail directed to these centers of population and business. It is just as important to the business man in Chicago or in New York that his letter, his trade journal, his price list, shall be carried to the villages, farms, and ranches far distant from railways as it is to the dwellers there that their orders for literature and merchandise shall be promptly dispatched; and the Government is just as much under obligations to give a prompt and reasonably frequent mail service to the dwellers in the sparsely settled regions of the country as it is to give a daily service to the dwellers in the more thickly populated portions of the country or a two to four times a day delivery to dwellers in towns and cities.

Twenty-five years ago we paid an average of nearly 10 cents a mile for carrying the star routes of the United States; to-day we are paying an average of a little over 3½ cents a mile for carrying these routes. Then we paid 15 cents a mile for carrying the routes in the Western section of the country; now we pay less than 4½

cents a mile, on an average, in the same section, as is shown by the statement herewith:

Statement showing the cost per mile traveled of star service in the entire country and in the different sections on June 30 of the years given.

Year.	Entire United States.	First section, Eastern.	Second section, Southern.	Third section, middle West.	Fourth section, far West.
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
1875.....	9.96	7.16	8.33	7.33	15.09
1880.....	9.62	6	6.65	5.55	14.36
1885.....	6.52	5.56	5.19	6.02	8.14
1890.....	5.46	5.31	4.47	5.44	7.02
1895.....	4.85	5.18	4.07	4.91	5.32
1900.....	3.87	3.79	3.30	3.39	4.45

First section.—States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Second section.—States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Kentucky.

Third section.—States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri.

Fourth section.—States and Territories of Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, Indian and Oklahoma, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Nevada, California, and Alaska.

This would certainly be a most gratifying showing of reduction in the cost of Government service if it were not for the fact that this reduction has been at the expense of good service and by beating down the compensation paid for doing this class of the Government's work to a figure which the most tyrannical taskmaster and the most avaricious and soulless oppressor of labor might well envy.

Let us examine for a moment into the question of the reduction of the cost of carrying star routes and determine whether or no the Government is justified in continuing a system which has led to such a tremendous reduction, to the detriment of the service and the oppression of those performing the same. The reduction in the cost of carrying star routes has been constant and continuous since 1875, and during that period of twenty-five years the reduction has been over 65 per cent in the country at large and nearly 75 per cent in the Western section.

During the same period in which this reduction of 65 per cent in the payment of the star-route carriers has taken place, it has been estimated by competent authority that there has been an average increase in the rate of wages paid in the United States of 10 per cent.

The value of horses, large numbers of which are required for the carrying of these star routes, is nearly the same that it was in 1875, and this class of animals are worth 100 per cent more in my section now than they were ten years ago, when the rates for carrying star routes were nearly double what they are to-day. While this reduction of 65 per cent in the cost of the carrying of star routes has been going on (despite the fact that the volume of mail carried has increased) there has been a reduction of only 14½ per cent in the cost of railway-mail pay.

So much for comparisons. Now, let us for a moment consider the amount actually paid to-day for the carrying of star routes. At the average price per mile paid, if the carrier travels 30 miles—and anyone who has any knowledge of the conditions knows that that is a great distance to cover per day each day in the year, rain or shine, heat or snow, over the average country road—if the carrier on horseback, in a gocar, or a four-wheeled vehicle covers this distance every day, he receives from the bountiful hands of this munificent Government the magnificent recompense of \$1.16 per day for his own labor and use of his animals and vehicle, less the blood money which the syndicate bidder exacts from him as his profit in the transaction.

If the carrier travels every day in the year except Sundays, including the Fourth of July and Christmas, he will have accumulated at the end of that period the princely sum of \$363.08, less the profit of the syndicate bidder, providing he has never missed a trip or delayed a mail, and providing that, in spite of the fact that the syndicate bidder may have neglected to pay him for six or eight months, he may have been able, by sponging his meals and horse feed from the people along the route, and standing off the country merchant for the few cheap clothes with which he has attempted to protect himself from the scorching heat of the summer and from the biting blasts of winter, to live up to his contract. If, on the other hand, long-delayed payment by the syndicate has had its intended effect in exhausting the credit and patience of the carrier and compelled him to abandon his route, his appeals to the syndicate for payment for the period during which he carried the mail is met with the statement that he is not entitled to pay because he has violated his contract. Appeals through the Post-Office Department are met by the ever resourceful syndicate bidder with the same plea of violated contract, backed up by a skillfully padded or fraudulently augmented statement of alleged expenses incurred by the syndicate in reletting the contract.

I have listened at various times with a good deal of interest to the efforts that have been made here to increase the pay of men in various branches of the postal service, working generally eight hours a day, protected from the inclemency of the weather, or, if exposed to it, only in so great a degree as one may be who travels the streets and sidewalks of cities and towns; men now receiving from \$800 to \$1,500 per annum, with annual leave with pay and all those other gracious privileges which a kind and indulgent Government has accorded to its public servants who are in a position to appeal en masse to the sympathies of members of Congress; and I have not been lacking in sympathy with some of these movements and efforts, but it seems to me that these advances in pay and emolument and privileges of public servants should be uniform all along the line, and I stand here to make an appeal for the videttes, the skirmishers of this postal army, a body of men with no organization through which they can appeal to Congress. They are the pioneers of the service; they constitute the absolutely indispensable multitudinous extremities of the postal circulation, without which the great heart and arteries would become palsied and paralyzed.

Compared with the hardships which the mail carrier is compelled to undergo, the lives of the other employees of the postal service are those of luxurious ease and comfort. He carries the mails of the people, winter and summer, by day and by night, through torrid heat and drenching rain, biting blasts and blinding snows; floundering through the almost impassable winter mud of Southern country roads or the heaped and drifted snows on Northern lanes; across the burning plains of the Southwest Territories, and through and across the mountain gorges and passes of the Northwest States; swimming the flood-swollen streams in the spring, bearing the heat and burden of the summer sun, drenched by the autumnal downpour and bitten by the blasts of winter as he faces the northers of Texas or snowshoes to mining camps through a Rocky Mountain blizzard. He is the hero of the service, and since its establishment has been the truest type of its indomitable energy in overcoming obstacles. He has been neglected, as the manner of mankind is, as humble and unpretentious heroes generally are, while the honors and the recognition which are rightfully his go to the carpet knight, accessible to the ear of influence and swift to fill it with importunings for special favors.

I doff my hat to the Postmaster-General of the United States and to the Second Assistant of that Department for their appreciation of the necessity for better service on star routes, and for the prompt and practical action taken to secure the same. The order of the 13th of February last will, it is hoped, result in curing the evils to which I have referred. Its effect will be to divorce the Government from the sweat-shop system to which it has been a party, put an end to the licensed confidence game of syndicate star routing, elevate the Government service on star routes to its proper dignity, result in the payment of a fair price for Government service, and give the people of rural districts in fact the service it has attempted to give, but signally failed to do under the old system.

The system of box delivery along star routes which has been inaugurated by the present Postmaster-General is the most important advance and improvement in the postal service which has been inaugurated for years. It carries, as far as practicable, the benefits of rural free delivery to large numbers of people living along star routes, and this with a cost to the Government which is almost infinitesimal. For these enlightened and practical efforts to give a better service to the people of the rural regions of the country the present administration of the Post-Office Department is entitled to great credit, and I rejoice in the tardy recognition which has been given to the star-route carrier—the scout and pioneer and hero of the postal service.

Mr. CROMER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield thirty minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER].

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, the pending bill making appropriations for service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, contains an appropriation which the report of the committee correctly states is similar to those made for a series of years in former acts, as follows:

For necessary and special facilities on trunk lines from New York and Washington to Atlanta and New Orleans, \$171,338.75. *Provided*, That no part of the appropriation made by this paragraph shall be expended unless the Postmaster-General shall deem such expenditure necessary in order to promote the interest of the postal service.

The amount of this appropriation is not large. It is indeed very small compared with the aggregate of the bill, which carries appropriations largely in excess of \$100,000,000. It affects the business interests of New York and other great commercial cities and centers of the East, to whom it is deeply important to have speedy mail and freight communication with the South and Southwest. It concerns the banker, broker, manufacturer, and the ordinary dealer. To the commercial cities and people of the South living on or near this great trunk line and the branch or lateral

railroads connecting with it and profiting by this speedy mail communication this appropriation possesses the greatest possible value.

They do not share in the comparatively small payment made to carry it out, for hardly any of them, I believe, are stockholders in these railroads, but they do share in the great benefit of speedy mail communication. Hence it is that whenever this appropriation has been assailed or menaced the intelligent commercial bodies of the Southern cities have come to the rescue and urged that this appropriation should not be disturbed. This interest is felt in a marked degree in the city I represent, but I do not believe that the interest of New Orleans in the policy now pursued is any greater than that of Atlanta or other communities lying on the line of route described in the appropriation.

The appropriation proposed follows the language of former appropriation acts, and it is hard to see how it could be more carefully guarded than it is. It is for "special facilities" on "trunk lines"—that is to say, for extra speed and quicker delivery. It is not merely for "special" facilities, but for "necessary" facilities. Nor is it an absolute appropriation, where the money is to be spent, right or wrong. The money is only to be spent if the Postmaster-General is convinced that it is "necessary for the interest of the public service."

I submit that the making of the appropriations from year to year, in spite of the most violent opposition in Congress, amounts to a very strong expression of opinion by the two Houses of Congress that this appropriation is necessary in order to secure "special" facilities for the postal service, and that this opinion of Congress ought to have great weight with the head of the Department. I think, further, that the Postmaster-General, however able and enlightened, might well deem the unanimous judgment of the bankers, merchants, shippers, and other business men of the South in respect to the value and necessity of this service a point well worthy of his consideration. Still, the responsibility is devolved upon the head of the Department of taking final action, and if this payment were an abuse, as has been most absurdly alleged, or were a mere gratuity to one or two trunk railroad lines, he could correct it.

It has happened time and time again in the history of this Government that Congress has made appropriations for this or that object and the Executive has refused to spend the money. I refer especially to river and harbor bills. It is true, indeed, that the people of the Southern States have a friendly feeling for the great railroad lines whose successful administration is so important to their growth and prosperity; but if only the railroad interest were involved they would not be found demanding this appropriation as earnestly as they do.

REMARKABLE BENEFITS.

I do not believe there is an appropriation contained in this act where the same amount of money accomplishes a larger amount of benefit to millions of people. I am amazed that the reformer, seeking to restore this Government to its pristine simplicity, purity, and economy, should run through our great annual appropriations of six or seven hundred millions of dollars and pounce on this little appropriation of \$171,000 in order to signalize his zeal and vigilance. Yet the debates on this paragraph have been protracted at every session of Congress since I have been in this Hall. A foreigner, sitting in our galleries, could hardly understand it, especially if he happened to see a bill appropriating a hundred and fifty millions of dollars rushed through after a debate of an hour or two. He would go home bewildered.

DISCUSSED FULLY.

This subject was fully discussed at the second session of the Fifty-third Congress, and among others by my colleague [Mr. ROBERTSON] and myself. In my brief remarks I referred to the appeals to continue this service coming up from the business men and commercial bodies of New Orleans and the whole country tributary to New Orleans. I stated then that these gentlemen had studied this question, knew their own interests, and that New Orleans was the second exporting city of the country. I pointed out the gain in time, and that we had two double fast mail trains from New York where we had one before. I also showed how, under the bill, the Postmaster-General regulated the schedules, and that these were regulated, not by the convenience and interests of the railroads, but by the public interests.

All these considerations apply with equal or greater force today.

It appeared in that debate that these appropriations for "special" facilities, which began as far back as 1875, had been kept up every year, and in a number of years had largely exceeded the appropriation which was then contemplated or the sum now to be appropriated. It was stated in debate that no Postmaster-General save Mr. Wanamaker had ever antagonized this appropriation. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. J. Lowrie Bell, had reported (see RECORD of April 24, 1894, page 4045) that the present mail schedules were "improvements over those which have heretofore been enforced."

I think it safe to say that the present schedules are an improvement on anything that went before over this important artery of commerce and mail communication, although the amount appropriated is smaller than in 1894.

Mr. Chairman, it has been boldly asserted in this House in these discussions that the mail service to the South has not been expedited by this appropriation and the service established under it by the Post-Office Department. In other words, that the commercial men, the business men of the South, and these other citizens have been laboring under a delusion in this whole business, that as a body they are so ignorant that they do not know whether they are getting one or getting two mails per day, or whether they are getting them much more expeditiously than they used to get them, and that in the matter of forwarding their mails and transmitting letters to New York and the Eastern cities they ought not to form an opinion at all, but wait until they are told by some member of the House what is their real condition.

AUGMENTED MAIL SERVICE.

I think it requires a great deal of hardihood for a member to rise in this House and assert that the mail facilities of the people of the South and Southwest have not been greatly augmented over the former system.

In the second session of the Fifty-fifth Congress the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] stated that the time for a letter to come from New York to Danville (his own town) had been reduced from eighteen hours and fifteen minutes to thirteen hours and thirty-five minutes, a saving of five hours. The time to Atlanta from New York had been cut down from thirty-three hours to twenty-four hours and twenty minutes, a saving of about eight and one-half hours. The gain between New York and Tampa is about fifteen hours, and the whole Cuban mail goes that way. Such was the showing made for this improved service in March, 1898.

Mr. GAINES. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Certainly.

Mr. GAINES. Have not the freight facilities been augmented also?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. Have they been subsidized?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Some of them. The subsidy now in question aids the beneficiaries in increasing the speed of all trains.

In this same connection there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 19, 1898, page 3005, an important letter from the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Shallenberger, dated March 3, 1898, in which he gives a statement of the improvement in this special Railway Mail Service. It is a letter too long to be read here, but it deserves to be read, as throwing a good deal of light on this whole matter. I may, however, mention some of the points contained in this letter, which is in reply to specific inquiries made by the Representative from Virginia.

In the first place, on February 1, 1893, there were from New York for New Orleans two through trains—one a fast train, No. 35, taking about thirty-nine hours, the other, No. 11, a slow train requiring forty-eight hours for the trip.

Another table furnished exhibited the service in March, 1898, under the special-facilities appropriation gives the time of trains No. 35 and No. 37 from New York to all the points on the route to New Orleans, and also such points as Houston, San Antonio, Knoxville, Birmingham, Memphis, Savannah, and Tampa. There are two fast mail trains running to New Orleans instead of one, one being thirty-nine hours and forty minutes, the other thirty-nine hours and ten minutes. Mr. Shallenberger speaks of the "great improvement" in mail service by the establishment of the new schedule.

Secondly, Mr. Shallenberger testifies that the schedule of lines connecting with Washington and New Orleans railway post-offices have been so modified that all important lateral communications are made for the interior of the Southern States.

Thirdly, There was no train operated on the Washington and New Orleans route in July, 1893, which took up the connection at Washington from the New York and Washington "fast mail" railway post-office leaving New York at 4.30 a. m. "Train 35, however, does make this connection, and the mails are greatly expedited thereby. The mails affected thereby are those from New England, New York State, and Pennsylvania for the Southern and Southwestern destinations."

Fourthly, "Railroad companies receiving extra compensation out of the special-facilities appropriation are required to furnish a schedule satisfactory to the Post-Office Department, and the arriving and departing time so fixed can not be changed except by consent of the Department."

Finally, Mr. Shallenberger says that "the service between Washington, D. C., Atlanta, and New Orleans, La., and other Southern and Southwestern territory has been very materially improved and the delivery of the mails expedited since March, 1893."

I consider this statement so specific in details and so emphatic

as conclusive upon the point stated, namely, of a great improvement in our postal service owing to this appropriation.

Mr. GAINES. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. GAINES. The fact is, about nine months after that letter was written he stated—and it is incorporated in these hearings, as was shown by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL]—that these subsidies for the New Orleans trains are not necessary to get a fast train.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I understand General Shallenberger simply confirms the statement made by Mr. Grant, as quoted by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL].

Mr. GAINES. Here is what he says:

I would say that this paper, having been prepared by Mr. Grant from official data, is of course official and authoritative and to be preferred to any statement I could make from memory.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I prefer to rely upon the experience of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, who year after year iterated and reiterated favorable reports in the matter, rather than to depend upon a single statement. In short, it is safer to believe that Mr. Shallenberger was correct in his conclusions year after year for a period of seven or eight years, and perhaps wrong in one instance, than to suppose that he was wrong seven successive years and brought to a right state of mind by Mr. Grant.

Mr. Grant also cites the case of the Queen and Crescent road, which competes with the Louisville and Nashville road, a non-subsidized system that makes just as fast time without the subsidy as they did with it.

I remind you of the fact that the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Company had this subsidy, as you call it, for a while and then threw it up as unprofitable. They were not willing to come up to the Department requirements. If it was a needless subsidy—a mere job—why did they throw it away? In this fact you have a pretty good indication of what we may have to expect if this appropriation be stopped. We shall have one fast mail and passenger train, perhaps, in twenty-four hours to New Orleans—what we used to have in old times. The whole country from Washington via Danville, Atlanta, Montgomery, and other points, with their lateral connections, will have to suffer the evils of a disarrangement of their mail communications and of a tardy, infrequent service.

Mr. GAINES. But that does not change the fact that the schedules of these roads when unsubsidized were just as fast as when subsidized. After the subsidy was withdrawn they did not change their running time from what it was before.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. My friend certainly knows that no railroad or other corporation would give up a subsidy of \$192,000 unless there was some disadvantage connected with it.

Mr. GAINES. But the remarkable statement is made here on this floor that other railroads do not want these subsidies and the people do not want them; yet the roads on this one route are asking them.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I never knew a corporation to reject a subsidy if it was in a condition to accept its terms profitably.

Mr. GAINES. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] have stated that Western roads—roads connected with the Kansas system—do not want these subsidies.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. But the fact remains that, while the Atlantic Coast Line gave up this subsidy, the Southern Railway Company would not take the contract previously held by the other line without it.

Mr. Chairman, to resume. Following the letter of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, there is a long and impressive statement, made by the officials of the Southern Railway Mail Service, which abundantly fortifies the positions of Mr. Shallenberger's letter.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE SOUTH.

I have no time to read it, but the critics who assail this appropriation, if they read it, ought to be able to see that they are striking a blow at nearly the entire mail service of the Southern States, at the business interests, as well as the happiness and convenience of millions of people.

I am aware, Mr. Chairman, that in the zeal to strike down this very small appropriation an effort has been made to show that the Post-Office Department is opposed to it and that the Department is authority for the statement that if this appropriation be withdrawn the eight or ten Southern States affected by it will still get as rapid and frequent mail communication as they have to-day. The Department has never put itself on record as saying anything of the kind. It has borne testimony, as I have shown you, to the great improvement in this mail service from New York, via Atlanta, to New Orleans, and to the fact of there being two fast mail trains per day where there used to be only one. In the extended debate had in the Senate some two years ago, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. SULLIVAN] quoted the Second As-

sistant Postmaster-General in reply to his specific inquiry whether the Department could secure the service as "prompt and frequent" without the so-called subsidy as with it. The response was:

I regret to say that I can not give a specific answer as to what we will be able to do. It is an open question.

It is true that the Post-Office Department has been willing to take chances on it. The people of the South, in the region I speak of—some ten millions of them—are not willing to take any chances. Their merchants, business men, and people generally are not willing to take any chances. They know a good thing when they see it or possess it, and they are just as anxious for speedy, frequent mail communication as the people of the North and East. Will you blame them for it?

It would have been a very extraordinary statement, indeed, if the Post-Office Department had reported that without this appropriation and authority they could have secured as prompt and efficient mail service for this Southern country as they have to-day. The answer would have been made at once. Why, then, have you been spending this money in the past unless you deemed the expenditure "necessary to promote the interest of the postal service?" The law made that fact a condition, test of the expenditure.

SOUTHERN CONDITIONS.

Again, we know that the railroads in the South are now under different conditions from those in the North. There are few large cities with us, and the country is sparsely settled. It does not pay to run fast passenger trains. To secure an additional fast mail train a day requires a special expenditure. The train starting from New York at 4.30 a. m. leaves at an hour when no passengers can be expected. They will naturally wait for the afternoon train.

This early train does, however, take the mails of New England, New York City and State, and all the mails over this long route are expedited.

There are few members in this House, from the East and North especially, who do not know the great value of time in the forwarding and reception of letters, and while their constituents may not be generally interested in this appropriation, many business men in the East will be apt to inquire how and why this appropriation should be singled out for special attack.

It is a melancholy fact that this contest should be renewed every year and that the people of eight or ten Southern States should be forced to fight for this slight recognition in the benefits of a common Government. It is somewhat in contrast with the policy which calls on the South thirty-five years after the close of the civil war to bear her share of the taxation involved in a grand pension system of \$150,000,000 per annum. The appropriation is called a "subsidy." That word does not frighten me at all. I am not afraid to vote for fair and just appropriations for all parts of the country.

There may be abuses, possibly great abuses, in your postal expenditures, but this is not one of them.

Mr. Chairman, my friend the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES], in his brief remarks during the course of Mr. BROMWELL's speech, seems to think that resolutions of boards of trade, of commercial and financial associations, and of State legislatures are of very little value.

Mr. GAINES. Did I say that they were not of any value?

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. I so understood the gentleman; at all events he attributes an ignorance of facts to them.

Mr. GAINES. I said that none of the bodies stated in their resolutions that they had any of the facts before them that we had before us to-day, and we have not had the facts before us heretofore that we have to-day.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a higher opinion of the wisdom of State legislatures than my friend from Tennessee. The legislature of his own State unanimously passed resolutions in favor of this appropriation; and constituencies that send such eminent and able gentlemen as the Tennessee representatives to these Halls (and of which my friend [Mr. GAINES] is a distinguished exemplar) can certainly be relied upon to select judicious and capable men to their State legislature—men who would not act incautiously in so important a matter. [Applause.]

As for myself, I concede great importance to such memorials; they spring from sources that appreciate more fully than we can do in the abstract at this distance, the value and necessity of expedition in business and rapidity of intercommunication.

I beg leave to read a letter from the president of the Cotton Exchange of New Orleans, one of the great commercial bodies of this country.

NEW ORLEANS, January 21, 1901.

DEAR SIR: The vast interests of not only New Orleans but the route covered by the fast-mail service are of themselves self-evident. The total commerce of this city for the year ended August 31 covered 12,045,734 tons, valued at \$516,823,449. Our direct trade through Northern ports covered 4,713,099 tons. The latter does not embrace all of our dealings with the East, as hundreds of millions of dollars of exchange business is transacted between New Orleans and New York.

All of this emphasizes the necessity for quick communication by mail between this city and the East. Not only are we seriously interested in this matter, but so are nearly all of the great cities of the East with which and through which we trade.

I might go on multiplying facts and figures, but the foregoing are, I trust, sufficient to indicate the importance of continuing our mail facilities as they have been. If any change is made it should certainly be in the direction of increased time.

Yours truly,

S. P. WALMSLEY,
President.

Hon. ADOLPH MEYER,
Member of Congress from Louisiana, Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, the most numerous mercantile organization in New Orleans is the New Orleans Board of Trade. Its membership numbers about 500 and embraces business men in all lines—bankers and merchants, manufacturers, and in all industrial pursuits.

It has a special committee on post route and mail facilities, composed of its most astute members, whose duty it is to promote and protect mail facilities. With your permission, I submit the following:

NEW ORLEANS BOARD OF TRADE, LIMITED,
New Orleans, January 23, 1901.

DEAR SIR: We thank you for your favor advising us of the threatened discontinuance of the fast mail service through the efforts to strike the appropriation from the bill.

This alarm arises every year or so, and we trust our efforts at present will prove as successful as previously. This matter is of vital importance to the entire section from New Orleans to Boston. No doubt the service involves some outlay on the part of the Government, but the many advantages more than compensate for that outlay. It has been claimed by those who oppose the appropriation that the railroads would continue the service in their own interest without any recompense whatever. This may or may not be the case. The service is of such considerable importance to this entire section that it is not desired to run any chances in the premises.

This fast mail service insures the maintenance of a fast daily train both ways. The route communicates at all points with other lines, and all parts of this section are brought into close communication with the North. The considerable shortening of time in handling foreign mails is a great consideration to this section, especially in the handling of commerce. The discontinuance of this fast mail service would not only work a hardship, but would prove of much injury to our commerce generally.

The service is considered of as great benefit and advantage to the Eastern States as it is to us, and therefore we feel that their Representatives in Congress could readily be prevailed upon to give their active support in retaining the appropriation, and the matter should certainly be placed before them in its true light with this object in view.

We sent you and each of our Representatives in Congress a copy of the resolutions adopted by this board.

Very truly, yours,

UDOLPHO WOLFE,
President.

Hon. ADOLPH MEYER, Washington, D. C.

NEW ORLEANS BOARD OF TRADE, LIMITED,
New Orleans, January 19, 1901.

DEAR SIR: The following resolutions were adopted by the New Orleans Board of Trade, Limited, and were approved by the other local commercial organizations of this city and the cooperation solicited of the other cities interested:

"Whereas the Board of Trade of New Orleans views with alarm the threatened discontinuance of the existing special fast mail service between New Orleans and the East through the possible failure on the part of the Committee on Postal Affairs to make provision for it in the general appropriation; and

"Whereas the loss of this service would work a great injury, not only to this city but to a great portion of the South and East; Therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the New Orleans Board of Trade, Limited, enters its most solemn protest against this threatened retrograde movement, and respectfully and earnestly urges the Committee on Postal Affairs of the House to reinstate and continue the appropriation for this service as heretofore.

"Resolved, That the Louisiana delegation in Congress, who are fully aware of the importance of this service to our commercial prosperity, are urged to give this subject their undivided attention and support.

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the Louisiana delegation in Congress, and to the commercial exchanges of New Orleans, Mobile, Montgomery, Atlanta, Baltimore, Washington, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston for their approval and support.

"Resolved, That the various exchanges named be requested to telegraph at once to their Congressional delegations, urging prompt action."

UDOLPHO WOLFE, President.
HY. H. SMITH, Secretary.

Hon. ADOLPH MEYER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

I have before me other memoranda in regard to action by commercial bodies, editorials from leading newspapers, etc., indorsing the fast mail, the reading of which want of time prevents, to wit:

Certified copy of resolution unanimously adopted by the Tennessee legislature.

Memphis, Tenn.: Strong article in the Scimitar.

Huntsville, Ala.: Editorial, Huntsville Evening Tribune; article, Huntsville Daily Mercury, showing resolution adopted by Chamber of Commerce and city council; copies of resolutions of the mayor and aldermen; resolution of Chamber of Commerce.

Birmingham, Ala.: Copy of the resolution of the mayor and board of aldermen of the city; resolution of the Commercial Club of Birmingham; resolution of the Board of Trade of Birmingham; clippings from the Birmingham Age-Herald of January 19 and January 22, indorsing fast mail; clipping from the Birmingham News, January 22; clipping from the Birmingham Daily Ledger, January 22; editorial comment, Birmingham papers, January 20 and 21.

Brunswick, Ga.: Resolution of the Board of Trade.

Knoxville, Tenn.: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce;

resolution of the Commercial Club; clippings, Knoxville Journal-Tribune, January 20 and 21; clipping, January 22, showing action of commercial bodies of Knoxville and legislature of Tennessee; editorial, January 20, Knoxville Journal-Tribune; Sentinel, Knoxville, January 21, showing action of commercial bodies.

New Orleans: Notice of the Daily Picayune, January 19; notice in Daily States, January 19; editorial, Times-Democrat, January 21; notice, Times-Democrat, January 21, showing action of Board of Trade; editorials from following papers, January 23: Daily States, Daily Picayune, Times-Democrat; copy of telegram from president of the Cotton Exchange to members of Congress.

Columbus, Miss.: Citizens of Columbus, Miss., wired Senators MONEY and SULLIVAN asking them to support the appropriation. Senators wired they would use their utmost.

Mobile, Ala.: Copy of resolution of the Chamber of Commerce. Strong telegrams were sent by the secretary of the Mobile Chamber of Commerce to Senators and Representatives in Congress. Mobile Register of January 20 and the Daily Item and Herald showing notices. (Clippings not sent.)

Chattanooga, Tenn.: Strong editorial, Chattanooga Times, January 24, also January 25. Item in the Chattanooga News January 22. Chambers of commerce will act upon the matter this week.

Atlanta, Ga.: Strong editorial in the Constitution.

Montgomery, Ala.: Strong editorial and notices in the Montgomery Advertiser. Commercial Club of Montgomery passes strong resolution. (Copy of it was not sent to this office.)

Asheville, N. C.: Board of Trade of the city passes resolution in favor of fast mail.

These are only a minor portion of the notices.

DUTY TO SOUTH.

Mr. Chairman, in passing upon this question of a fast railway mail service for the Southern States, it is our duty to look at the situation presented to-day in that section of the Union. It is true that we do not have in the South large cities such as they have in the North and which force the railroads there to expedite their trains in order to secure business.

GROWING SOUTH.

But our cities and towns all exhibit a gratifying increase. This is especially the case in my own city of New Orleans. What is true of the towns and cities—of New Orleans, Galveston, Vicksburg, Memphis, Nashville, Mobile, and Atlanta—is also true of the Southern States in which they lie. There is a large, steady, and gratifying increase of the population.

The State of Louisiana so far exceeded the average rate of increase for the Union that she became entitled to an additional member of Congress under each of the two rival plans of reapportionment presented to us the other day. Such comparatively new and fertile States as Kansas and Nebraska did not present an equal increase with Louisiana, although they possess great resources and are located on great lines of railroads. For a long period after the civil war, depressed and discouraged by military rule, by reconstruction, negro and carpetbag ascendancy, the South made little or no progress. But as these evils were removed or mitigated the South began to put on a new life. The tree apparently dead began to put forth leaves and branches, and already we behold the fruit. Our cotton crop has been largely developed and for a year or two past the prices have been remunerative. Other crops have done well. The cotton seed once deemed useless has been converted into a most valuable product.

AGRICULTURE IMPROVED.

Every branch of agriculture has improved. Our mines of iron and coal have been developed and we now manufacture pig iron cheaper than any country in the world. We are making steel and selling it abroad. Both of these industries are yet in their infancy. There is hardly any limit to their respective growth.

NEW MILLS.

Cotton mills are going up every day. We are manufacturing coarse cottons cheaper than any other people in the world. Our mills are beginning to make the highest grades of cotton goods, and it is only a question of time when the South shall monopolize the cotton manufacture of this country and export these goods freely to other lands. [Applause.]

Many other kinds and forms of manufacturing industry are rapidly springing up. There is hardly one of them that can be mentioned in which the South does not possess equal or superior advantages to any other State of this Union.

SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRY.

Shipbuilding, which has been regarded as exclusively a Northern industry, is now being actively prosecuted at Newport News and on the James River in Virginia. In this rapid forward movement of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce is it not clear to every intelligent mind that rapid, frequent mail's are an essential, necessary ingredient? This rapid communication between the South and the North and East is necessary to both—to all the country. [Applause.] To deny it would be a reproach and a scandal.

This, however, is only a part of the story. It is evident that we are on the threshold of a larger, greater commerce with South America, the West Indies, including Cuba, Mexico, and Central America, than ever before. All these countries are rapidly developing. They are attracting immigration, capital, and are about to improve their grand resources.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

The building of the Nicaragua Canal, now an almost assured fact, will give a special stimulus to this coming trade. Cuba, freed from the yoke of Spain, will exhibit fourfold activities. The South is, or will be, in close touch with all these countries. Your mails and your richest products must pass through her ports and gateways in order to reach these countries. Surely this is no hour for a narrow vision, a contracted policy, or a neglect of the agencies which stimulate commerce and enhance the wealth, power, and glory of our Republic. [Applause.]

I must not omit to state that this work of Southern rehabilitation and progress is mainly, almost exclusively, the work of our own sons. It is not the creation of Northern men or the result of foreign immigration. The immigrants from the Northern States or from Europe have followed the lines of climate. They have gone West. More of our sons have gone North and West than the number who have reinforced our ranks of labor and production. We have a right to be proud of this fact. We are paying our full share of the expenses of this Government. Our crops of cotton, tobacco, and other exports go far to swell your favorable balance of trade and bring back foreign gold. We pay heavily for appropriations in which we reap no benefit, and it is a very small return to allow this moderate mail appropriation, so important to our commerce, to remain undisturbed. [Loud applause.]

Mr. LOUD. Mr. Chairman, it was my intention to ask the House to close debate upon this bill at the conclusion of my remarks to-morrow. I did not open the debate on the bill, because I desired to accommodate some gentlemen who were obliged to go away. I would like to find out now, if I can, from gentlemen on the other side whether any more time is desired in general debate.

Mr. MADDOX. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURKE] has just left the House. He told me that he expected to speak to-morrow.

Mr. MOON. It seems to me that we require a little more time on this side for debate. My colleague [Mr. GAINES] desires a short time. Perhaps he is ready to go on this evening.

Mr. LOUD. I have no objection, if the gentleman [Mr. MOON] will yield to his colleague.

Mr. MOON. I yield to my colleague [Mr. GAINES].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has ten minutes.

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, the right of petition was a right enjoyed by our forefathers before they came to America. When they came here as colonists they brought that right with them; and when it was denied they rebelled. When we framed our Constitution and the fundamental laws of this country we planted this right in those instruments. It is a natural right, and I have a great respect for the "right" and those who rightfully exercise it. There is no right that is more precious to the American people or to the human family than the right of petition.

Mr. Chairman, the legislature of the State of Tennessee has respectfully petitioned my colleagues and myself to vote for this subsidy. They have not stated in that petition a single fact which could have warranted the conclusion which they have reached, or which could persuade my judgment to indorse and grant the prayer of that petition. I am satisfied that the body from which this petition comes had not all the facts before them that we have here to-day, clear, plain, official, and conclusive. Nor has this Congress ever had the facts so plainly and so clearly before it as now. Nor has Congress ever had these facts before it before.

Mr. Chairman, I received that petition and respectfully and with pleasure filed it under the rules of this House. They will be found in the sacred archives of this great country when I have long since passed out of this honorable body and at rest in the shade of the trees beyond the river.

Mr. Chairman, I have given the same consideration to resolutions coming here from the chamber of commerce in Knoxville and Chattanooga that I have to the petition of the legislature. I have respectfully filed them all together. Not only the right to petition, but to remonstrate, is a right planted not only in the fundamental laws of this my native land, but is the law of the State of my nativity, whose constitution Thomas Jefferson said was the best he had ever read.

But, Mr. Chairman, with the facts of this case clearly before me as they have been exploited here to-day, clearly showing from the record before us that this subsidy is not necessary to secure proper mail service, what is my duty? Sir, not a single farmer, not a single merchant, not a single physician, not a single divine, not a single school-teacher, not a single individual of any class, has written me a letter upon this subject. In this situation, am I to sit here blind to the fact that this subsidy is not necessary, and must I forsooth vote for it because one of the railroads that is to get the

benefit from it runs into Nashville, my home? And when it is said here "the railroads do not want the subsidy," pray who does, then? Not the railroads; not the people. Who?

Why, what, Mr. Chairman, would a great judge sitting as a trial court say to a verdict brought in by a jury contrary to the evidence deposed by General Shallenberger and Mr. Grant and the evidence of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], of the committee, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROMWELL], of the committee, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], chairman of the committee, of the other members, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLEMING], and my colleague [Mr. MOON], also a member, all of whom say that this subsidy is not necessary and that the mail trains would make as good time without it as with it?

The gentleman from California [Mr. LOUD], whose integrity, knowledge, and courage no man in this House doubts, says the trains ran as fast into New Orleans before as since the subsidy. I read the hearings at page 456, volume 1:

Mr. LOUD. I make the statement that the trains made the same time before the subsidy was granted that they do now.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I will ask you that question. Did the unsubsidized trains make as fast time before the subsidy was granted, as to the Southern road, as they do now?

Mr. LOUD. I assert that they made the same time in December, 1892, that they do now.

That is, Mr. Chairman, December 1, 1898.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Well, I am asking for information.

"I am asking for information," says the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS], and he got it from a member of this committee, who has had years of experience in this investigation, and yet the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] here to-day urges this subsidy without disproving this and other undisputable proof. To do what, I ask? To make a train run as fast as it is already running, and, sirs, will continue to run without this subsidy, as the proof here shows, on pages 454-455, and no one dare to show facts—not dicta, but facts—to disprove.

Would a trial judge permit a verdict for a subsidy to stand for a single moment with such testimony as this given the jury? These gentlemen know the facts. Here are men who have investigated the matter thoroughly and for months and months. Can there be any doubt as to the propriety of following their judgment?

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to state that I have myself some testimony in connection with this matter that has never been fully put into the RECORD, and I shall be delighted to use it to-day, as it has governed me on former occasions in this matter. And more, I am glad to know that the Department itself has taken sides one way or the other in connection with this appropriation. There seemed to be some doubt as to its position and the official data, but now there is no doubt. In the Fifty-fifth Congress, when this matter came up, I was anxious to get at all of the facts, as I always am in connection with public matters on this floor.

I try to treat every measure, regardless of which side it comes from, with absolute fairness, seriously, conscientiously, intelligently, and patriotically, as far as I can, and use my best endeavors to obtain the fullest light upon every matter that is presented for our consideration before I act finally. And, Mr. Chairman, I was informed, when I asked General Shallenberger, with reference to this subsidy, if it was "necessary for the transportation of the mails"—I remember his metaphor, and can quote, I think, almost exactly the identical language—certainly the substance used in reference to it. He said:

When the tree was young it needed support. When the railroads were young we needed a subsidy to help them along. But the railroads have grown strong; they have reached a period when they can stand alone, when they have sufficient capital to support themselves, and we do not need the subsidy. The tree can stand alone.

He again said, also, "that we are getting as good service without the subsidy on certain railroads as with it;" and hence with that testimony before me in the Fifty-fifth Congress I have voted consistently against this measure, and the great governor of the State of Tennessee, who honors that State with an able administration of her laws, and is honored himself again by an overwhelming ballot of the great Democratic party he so ably served in this House, stood by my side here in this House and voted against this subsidy upon the same ground and upon the same information he had received and that I had received—that is, the testimony of General Shallenberger that this appropriation was not now needed, which is much less evidence of that fact than we now have with this report before us.

And further than that, Mr. Chairman, if gentlemen will examine the pages of the report which has been submitted by this special commission appointed to investigate postal affairs, what do we find? We find on pages 448 and 449 of the report that Mr. Grant is indorsed in his statement fully by Mr. Shallenberger. Mr. Grant says:

There seems to be no justification for the special-facilities payments, judging from results obtained. If we treated all lines on this basis, then we should pay the Northwestern Railroad for running an early morning train from Chicago (at 2.45 a. m.) to Fort Howard, Wis.; also for Cedar Rapids from Chicago.

We should also pay the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul Railroad for a

train leaving Chicago at the same hour, and running to Marion and the West; also the same road for a train from Chicago to Milwaukee and St. Paul; the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy for a train leaving Chicago at 3 a. m. and running to Burlington and Omaha; the Monon Route for a train leaving Chicago in the early morning for Cincinnati. The Illinois Central also has a train leaving Chicago about the same hour, as has also the Pittsburg, Fort Wayne and Chicago, and the Lake Shore and Michigan Southern. The Missouri Pacific runs a train out of St. Louis at 3 o'clock in the morning; so does the Iron Mountain; also the Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern; the Pennsylvania for Indianapolis and the East, and the Wabash for Toledo and the East. The Baltimore and Ohio Southwestern also runs a train out of Cincinnati about the same hour. The Cincinnati, Hamilton and Dayton also has a train out of Cincinnati at about 3 a. m. The Michigan Central runs a train out of Detroit about the same hour; so does the Flint and Pere Marquette.

From this it can be seen that the railroad companies can be induced to run trains at an hour not calculated to draw passenger traffic, but mainly for the interest of the mails. All of these early morning trains have been secured without special-facilities payments.

In 1893 the Department discontinued the special-facilities appropriation for the Atlantic Coast Line from New York, by way of Washington, Wilmington, Charleston, and Savannah, to Jacksonville, but Congress, without any recommendation from the Department, made an appropriation for improved facilities between New York and New Orleans, by way of Philadelphia, Washington, Charlotte, Montgomery, and Mobile. There is no question but that the service was improved between New York and New Orleans, but whether the improvements could not have been secured without the payment of special-facilities money is an open question. We can only judge by what has been accomplished in other directions.

In 1894 the Department secured a special fast mail on the St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern Railroad, leaving St. Louis at 3 a. m. and running on fast time to Texarkana, making connection with the Texas and Pacific, and thus reaching nearly all of the principal points in Texas. At that time the company was running two through trains daily, one leaving St. Louis at 10 a. m. and arriving at Texarkana at 8.15 a. m. the next day, the other leaving St. Louis at 8.15 p. m. and reaching Texarkana at 1.20 p. m. the next day. The new fast mail train left St. Louis at 3.05 a. m. and arrived at Texarkana at 9.30 p. m., and was clearly additional service. The speed of this train is about 30 miles an hour, including stops.

In 1890 the Illinois Central, at the solicitation of the Department, put on a train out of Chicago, leaving at 3 a. m., and running through to New Orleans. This train was in addition to service then operated, and was secured solely on account of the additional business which would accrue from the improved facilities. This train makes a speed of 36 miles an hour, including stops, from Chicago to Cairo, and 30 miles an hour, including stops, from Cairo to New Orleans.

As an evidence that special-facilities money is not necessary to enable railroads in the South to operate fast trains, I would cite the fact that the Louisville and Nashville Railroad maintains two through trains daily between Cincinnati and New Orleans, in addition to trains for local service. These through trains make a speed of 33 and 28 miles an hour, respectively, including stops.

The Queen and Crescent system, which competes with the Louisville and Nashville between Cincinnati and New Orleans, also runs two trains daily between Cincinnati and New Orleans, which are run at a speed of 31 and 32 miles an hour, respectively, including stops.

The Florida Central and Peninsular, which competes with the Atlantic Coast Line for Florida business, runs two through trains a day between Columbia and Jacksonville. The Atlantic Coast Line has not reduced its train service in consequence of the withdrawal of the special-facilities payments, but still maintains two through trains daily, in connection with the Pennsylvania and other lines interested, between New York and Jacksonville, and during the heavy business in the winter time puts on a special fast train in addition.

Mr. Shallenberger then says:

I would state that this was prepared by Mr. Grant for the use of the committee, as he informed me, and I would ask that it be filed as a part of my remarks.

So, then, as to these Illinois subsidies, they tell us that they have increased the mileage on this road to 36 miles an hour. Now, as a matter of fact, the Louisville and Nashville road have a train which runs at about as great a rate from Louisville to Nashville and has no subsidy, Grant says; and the same may be said of the Florida Central system. And there is another statement unchallenged and undisputed, to wit, that the Atlantic Coast Line has not reduced its special service in consequence of the withdrawal of the special subsidy. That road keeps up the service, in connection with the Atlantic Line from Pennsylvania—the Pennsylvania Railroad, which connects with it here—and throughout the winter season has a special train in addition for the accommodation of winter passengers to Florida.

So, I repeat, there can be no possible just ground for the continuance of this subsidy. And, Mr. Chairman, there is no longer any conjecture about it. We have heard a good deal said to-day about the effect of the withdrawal of the subsidy. My distinguished friend from Mississippi [Mr. CATCHINGS] need not doubt that this fast service will be continued if it is withdrawn. He must know that the Southern roads are operating on just as good a schedule as the subsidized road, and one of them has absolutely refused to reduce the speed of its trains after the subsidy was withdrawn. He must know that if this subsidy is withdrawn, the other road, by reason of competition, will have to keep up just the same character of traffic and the same kind of trains.

If they do not, of course, as a natural consequence, the business of the road will drift in other directions. And yet, because General Shallenberger can not swear positively that he could carry on, beyond each and every doubt, the service without this subsidy, we are to go on, year after year and year after year, and put our hands into the Treasury of the people, where the hard earnings of the people are piled up under unrighteous tax laws, and pay the railroads millions of their money for attending to their own business, even after they say they do not want the compensation and are able to do without it. Is there any justification for such a proceeding?

Mr. Chairman, are not the fast freight trains of the country, I would ask, running faster than ever before in the history of the country? Let us take those trains as an illustration of what we may expect if this subsidy bill shall fail of enactment.

Is there a man within the sound of my voice who will dispute that? I pause to allow any gentleman on the floor of the House to dispute the fact that the freight trains of this country run faster than ever before? [After a pause.] No one denies, Mr. Chairman. Nobody dare dispute the fact.

Now, the freight trains are not subsidized. Yet I am to be criticised because I exercise my God-given judgment upon the facts before me, simply because a few people of my great State, who have honored me far beyond my deserts, have said, as I contend without all if any of the facts, that they favor this bill; and even if they have the facts, I want to say they show, and the truth is incontrovertible, that this subsidy is not needed. The railroads do not want it. The people who sent me here have not asked for it, and in my judgment it should not be given. Therefore I feel it my duty to myself, that I may carry to my humble couch to-night, as I try to in reference to all my duties, a clear conscience, to vote against this measure. And I make this statement here in defense of the position that I have taken upon this floor consistently in the Fifty-fifth and Fifty-sixth Congresses. [Applause.]

And then, on motion of Mr. LOUD, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CANNON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the Post-Office appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles: when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12513. An act to extend the privileges of the seventh section of the immediate transportation act to Saginaw, Mich.;

H. R. 10664. An act granting permission to the Indians on the Grand Portage Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota, to cut and dispose of the timber on their several allotments on said reservation; and

H. R. 8814. An act to provide for the entry of lands formerly in the Lower Brulé Indian Reservation, S. Dak.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. R. 142. Joint resolution to enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice-President of the United States, March 4, 1901.

OLIVER H. CRAM.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with a resolution of the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), I return herewith the bill (H. R. 10761) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Cram."

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, February 5, 1901.

Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the two Houses be authorized and directed to correct the enrolled bill of the House (H. R. 10761) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Cram," by striking out the words "Oliver H. Cram" wherever they occur in the title and text and inserting "Orville H. Cram."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. RYAN of Pennsylvania, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO WITHDRAW PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, on motion of Mr. GRIFFITH, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Ruth A. Avery, Fifty-sixth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. LOUD (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Commissioner of Patents, transmitting his annual report for the calendar year 1900—to the Committee on Patents, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses of International Convention for Protection of Industrial Property—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of A. P. Rutherford, administrator of estate of William Kountz, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of W. A. Collier, administrator of estate of Winfred Collier, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of J. G. W. Tompkins and J. C. Brown, administrators of estate of Rachael M. Tompkins, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of Nathan H. Whitlow against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of Miller Isbell against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting the annual report of the Washington and Marlboro Railway Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. WANGER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13842) to authorize the Glassport Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2664); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BRICK, from the Committee on the Territories, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13770) providing for the election of a Delegate from the district of Alaska to the House of Representatives of the United States, defining citizenship and the qualifications of electors in said district, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2665); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13962) to extend the time granted to the Muscle Shoals Power Company by an act approved March 3, 1899, within which to commence and complete the work authorized in said act to be done by said company, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2666); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9153) granting the right of way to Alafia, Manatee and Gulf Coast Railroad Company through the United States light-house and military reservations on Gasparilla Island, in the State of Florida, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2703); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2489) to provide for the further distribution of the reports of the Supreme Court, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2704); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KERR of Ohio, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4550) providing for an additional circuit judge in the Second judicial circuit, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2705); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MERCER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9709) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a municipal building in the city of Washington, D. C., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2706); which

said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bills of the House (H. R. 3724 and H. R. 8855) authorizing the purchase of a site for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 14064), accompanied by a report (No. 2707); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1730) granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. Jones, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2667); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5409) granting an increase of pension to John W. Phillips, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2668); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2401) granting a pension to Maggie Black, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2669); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5675) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Holmes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2670); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10007) granting a pension to Blanche Duffy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2671); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5428) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Cole, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2672); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8333) for the relief of Mrs. Annie S. Hummel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2673); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5451) granting an increase of pension to Mary M. Hyde, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2674); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13586) granting a pension to Milton Phillips, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2675); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 648) granting a pension to Margaret G. White, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2676); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13585) granting a pension to Nancy Cate, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2677); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13794) granting a pension to Hix Patterson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2678); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5170) granting a pension to Louise Wolcott Knowlton Browne, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2679); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8080) granting a pension to Mrs. Elcy Bennett, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2680); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8891) to increase the pension of William Rheuby, reported the same with

amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2681); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11902) granting a pension to William K. Hoffman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2682); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13814) granting a pension to John B. Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2683); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3580) granting an increase of pension to Theron Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2684); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8537) granting a pension to Mary Ann Merrow, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2685); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13895) granting an increase of pension to Dr. E. M. Kanouse, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2686); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4731) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta M. Leiper, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2687); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5074) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Bridges, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2688); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13926) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Moulton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2689); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13925) granting a pension to Richard Howell, alias George Carroll, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2690); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13924) granting a pension to Jane Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2691); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 413) granting a pension to Albert S. Cummings, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2692); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13402) granting a pension to William W. Plank, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2693); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13699) granting an increase of pension to Samuel C. F. Seabury, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2694); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SHAW, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13747) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Schram, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2695); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5431) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ball, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2696); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5326) granting a pension to Maggie Alice Brady, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2697); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6500) granting a pension to Elisha T. Bisbee, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2698); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which

was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14015) granting a pension to Alexander Gossett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2699); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 248) for the relief of Winslow Warren, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2700); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11659) to pay claimants for goods and effects lost or destroyed by fire at Ellis Island, New York, on June 15, 1897, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2701); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12596) for the relief of Mrs. Julia L. Hall, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2702); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 14038) to revive and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pittsburg and Mansfield Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River"—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SALMON (by request): A bill (H. R. 14039) to grant the right of way to and authorize the Union Electric Construction Company to build, own, and operate in and through the District of Columbia an electric railway—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MERCER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds: A bill (H. R. 14064) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the erection thereon of a court of justice building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 300) canceling the license of certain traders on the Osage Indian Agency, in Oklahoma Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MERCER: A resolution (H. Res. 408) providing for consideration of bills reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GAINES: A joint resolution of the legislature of Tennessee, favoring a public building at Springfield, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a joint resolution of the legislature of Tennessee, favoring the fast-mail subsidy—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOREING: A bill (H. R. 14040) granting a pension to Martha Maddox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14041) granting a pension to George W. Ingram—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14042) granting an increase of pension to Kephart Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14043) granting an increase of pension to Perry F. Belden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14044) granting an increase of pension to Sophia Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 14045) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. Philpott—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 14046) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Brittingham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAHLE: A bill (H. R. 14047) to provide compensation for injuries received by George E. Giles, of Watertown, Wis., at the Ford's Theater disaster, which occurred June 9, 1893—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HITT: A bill (H. R. 14048) for the relief of William Vincent—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 14049) amending the record of Howard W. Seager—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JETT: A bill (H. R. 14050) granting an increase of pension to Joel J. Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: A bill (H. R. 14051) for the relief of Margaret Myers—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14052) for the relief of the personal representative of the estate of Alexander Myers, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 14053) granting a pension to Mary Diefenbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 14054) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 14055) granting an increase of pension to George W. Bush—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 14056) granting a pension to Vincent Daucer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14057) for the relief of John Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14058) for the relief of William J. Wilcoxson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN of New York: A bill (H. R. 14059) granting a pension to Mary Weiss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 14060) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of John Brewster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 14061) for the relief of Wolfe Abrahams—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. STEWART of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 14062) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo Weeks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 14063) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Simpson Coplin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 14065) granting a pension to A. J. De Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of internal-revenue gaugers, storekeepers, etc., of the Twenty-third collection district of Pennsylvania, asking for an increase of pay—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the First Presbyterian Church of Canonsburg, Pa., for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of the First Presbyterian Church of Canonsburg, Pa., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOREING: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Perry F. Belden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Sophia Campbell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of George W. Ingram—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Kephart Wallace—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRICK: Petition of citizens of Mishawaha, Ind., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Peter Turner and other letter carriers, in favor of the letter carriers' salary bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BROSIUS: Petitions of E. E. Kauffman and M. B. Fleck, of Lancaster, Pa., favoring uniform marriage and divorce laws, anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution, and certain other measures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolutions of the physical science department of the Nebraska State Teachers' Association, in favor of the establishment of the national standardizing bureau—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, resolutions of the National Board of Trade, in favor of House bill No. 887, relating to the Philadelphia Commercial Museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CALDERHEAD: Petition of the American Baking Powder Association, in behalf of the Brosius pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Pasteur Vaccine Company, of Chicago, Ill., opposing the free distribution of medicinal remedies—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Henry Funnell, of Clifton, Kans., for the repeal of the duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of the Rhode Island Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the passage of the Gillet bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of R. L. B. Clark and Joseph Tayel Theresa, delegates to the Republican convention of 1856, in favor of the erection of a monument to John C. Fremont—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Resolutions of the

National Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887 in behalf of the Philadelphia Commercial Museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York: Resolutions adopted by a joint committee of 18 commercial organizations of the city of New York, urging better postal facilities in that city—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the National Board of Trade, for such legislation as will strengthen our maritime position—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, resolutions of the National Board of Trade, advocating the passage of House bill No. 887, in behalf of the Philadelphia Commercial Museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Group 7, New York Bankers' Association, advocating the repeal of war taxes on checks, notes, drafts, and other bills of exchange—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOWLER: Petition of the Civics Club of Orange, N. J., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAINES: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Knoxville, Tenn., asking the Speaker of the Fifty-seventh Congress to give Tennessee representation on the Rivers and Harbors Committee—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, sundry petitions of the Chamber of Commerce of Nashville, Tenn., favoring the enlargement of the work of the Geological Survey so as to include mapping of forest regions in Southern and Eastern portions of the country, and certain other measures—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILBERT: Petition of the internal-revenue gaugers, storekeepers, etc., of the Fifth collection district of Kentucky, for sufficient appropriation to provide for their vacation without loss of pay—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. J. S. Ferguson, of Keokuk, Iowa, in behalf of the National Association of Union Ex-Prisoners of War, in support of House bill No. 12461, favoring pensions to soldiers confined in Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Connecticut, Cornelia B. Forbes, president, urging the passage of House bill No. 12551, for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HITT: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of William Vincent—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACK: Petition of 125 citizens of Manor, Pa., urging the banishment of the liquor traffic in Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. JOY: Petition of Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of the anti-polygamy amendment—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, in favor of ratification of treaty which aims at the banishment of the traffic in alcoholic liquors from a great part of the continent of Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, in favor of House bill No. 8497, known as the Littlefield bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, for protection against Sunday traffic, etc., in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Lucas Avenue Cumberland Presbyterian Church, of St. Louis, favoring uniform marriage and divorce laws, and certain other measures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENTZ: Petition of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of Delaware, Ohio, favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of the Northwestern Steamship Company, of Chicago, Ill., relating to the passage of the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Jacob Rehm and other citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring the improvement of the Calumet River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McALEER: Petition of the National Board of Trade, in behalf of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Three papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Charles R. Van Trees—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: Papers in support of House bill granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bliss—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'GRADY: Petition of tobacco manufacturers of Rochester, N. Y., relating to the tax on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILLIPS: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Berea, Ohio, favoring uniform marriage and divorce laws, and certain other measures—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petition of citizens of Binghamton, N. Y., asking for the abolishment of the traffic in liquor in Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of New York City, N. Y., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany House bill No. 2244, for the relief of the Episcopal Church at Remington, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of Rev. J. A. P. McGaro and 26 others, of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging the passage of a measure providing a permanent supply of live water for irrigating purposes for the Pima and Papago Indians in Arizona—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Petition of the internal-revenue gaugers, storekeepers, etc., of the Second collection district of New York, for sufficient appropriation to provide for their vacation without loss of pay—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the National Board of Trade in favor of House bill No. 887, to make appropriation to complete collection of foreign trade samples and to provide for gathering information on same in connection with the Philadelphia Museum—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of citizens of South Lyon, Mich., favoring anti-polygamy amendment to the Constitution—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPERRY: Remonstrance of citizens of Middletown, Conn., against the passage of House bill No. 12743—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Protest of citizens of Wichita Falls, Tex., against the parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, protest of citizens of the Indian Territory against the passage of the Flynn bill, dividing the Territory into counties—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: Resolutions of the physical science section of the Nebraska State Teachers' Association, favoring the passage of House bill No. 11350, to establish the national standardizing bureau—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. TONGUE (by request): Statements containing charges against ROBERT W. WILCOX, Delegate from Hawaii—to the Committee on Elections No. 1.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 6, 1901.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. HALE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

SEACOAST BATTERY AT MILITARY ACADEMY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of War submitting a supplementary estimate of appropriation under "Buildings and grounds, Military Academy," for the construction of emplacements for a modern seacoast battery for the instruction of cadets, \$167,000; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD PRODUCTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Industrial Commission, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 26th ultimo, a review and digest of the testimony concerning the adulteration of food products, together with a separate digest of certain additional evidence relating to baking powder, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and ordered to be printed.

WASHINGTON AND MARLBORO RAILWAY COMPANY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington and Marlboro Railway Company; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13491) authorizing the Mount Carmel Development Company to draw water from Wabash River at Grand Rapids, Wabash County, Ill.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the two Houses to correct the enrolled bill of the House (H. R. 10761) granting an increase of pension to Oliver H. Cram, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (H. R. 8814) to provide for the entry of lands formerly in the Lower Brulé Indian Reservation, South Dakota;

A bill (H. R. 10664) granting permission to the Indians on the Grand Portage Indian Reservation, in the State of Minnesota, to cut and dispose of the timber on their several allotments on said reservation;

A bill (H. R. 12513) to extend the privileges of the seventh section of the immediate-transportation act to Saginaw, Mich.; and

A joint resolution (S. R. 142) to enable the Secretary of the Senate to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President and Vice-President of the United States, March 4, 1901.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of T. A. Shafer and 79 other citizens of Hagerstown, Ind., praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petitions of Tabor Ham and 154 citizens of Mishawaka, J. L. McKinney and 19 other citizens of Terre Haute, and of Dr. W. E. George and 16 other citizens of Indianapolis, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUARLES presented a petition of the Wisconsin Cheese Makers' Association, praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Fruit and Produce Exchange of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the repeal of the war-revenue tax on bank checks; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Stuart Reid Lodge, No. 300, International Association of Machinists, of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the hours of daily labor of workmen and mechanics, and also to protect free labor from prison competition; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HOAR presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Boston, Mass., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of the Farmers' Institute of Delaware County, Iowa, praying for the enactment of the so-called Grout bill, to regulate the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry business firms of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a minimum tax of 1 per cent on bucket-shop transactions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of A. M. Whetzel and sundry other citizens of Guthrie Center, Iowa, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. G. G. Wheeler and sundry other citizens of Burt, Iowa, and the petition of Rev. DeWitt White and sundry other citizens of Crawford, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to the native races in Africa; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FRYE presented the petition of H. R. Watson, of Tarrytown, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to limit the hours of daily labor of workmen and mechanics, and also to protect free labor from prison competition; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Taos, N. Mex.; of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Anadarko, Okla., and of the Massachusetts Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Boston, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to the native races in Africa; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

THE NAVY.

Mr. HALE. I present certain communications from the Secretary of the Navy, each distinct by itself, transmitting some figures with reference to the cost of ships and force of men employed in the Navy. I move that each communication, with the accompanying paper, be printed as a separate document, and that the statement compiled from letters to Congress from the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, and other sources relative to the present need of the Navy for additional